The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

Is it a nightmare from which we shall shortly awake, or is it really true that Britain is again at war? The answer is only too certain.

This issue was prepared when there was still hope of peace, one or two pages being kept for the early days of September. Sad indeed is it that we must chronicle that these days brought Europe to war. How difficult it is to preach or to write in such a catastrophe, when the very earth seems shaking under one's feet. But there are things which cannot be shaken, and it is to the eternal and unchanging God that Christians turn for hope and help. The day these words were written a minister of wide experience was heard to say, "I shall preach on 'Remember Jesus Christ, raised from the dead'; it was either that or, 'Fear not them which kill the body, and after that have nothing more they can do' ". There spoke a wise man, whose people would not look to him in vain.

We are very conscious of the opportunity the war brings to the Churches. It is generally agreed that they failed in the last war, and they cannot be said to have redeemed themselves since—Mr. Edward Thompson has recently said, brutally but truly, that the Archbishop of Canterbury's "Recall to Religion" was a "flop". Can the Churches show to warring men that they have a message indispensable for the times, and a gospel which never fails to sustain? On the answer to that question rests the future of organized religion.

One of the main avenues of service for the Churches was suggested in the religious services broadcast by the B.B.C. in the days immediately preceding the outbreak of war. With one or two exceptions (one was jaunty, the other doleful) they were all such services ought to be, dignified yet intimate, and all the time giving the assurance that there was a place where calm and confidence were to be found. Can Christians give the same assurance by their bearing from day to day? If so, the example of faith and courage, patience and good cheer, may turn countless thousands to ask whence is the source of their strength.

In other ways too the behaviour of Christians should be manifest to all. Theirs it is to carry comfort wherever they go, to strengthen the weak hands and confirm the feeble knees, and say to them that are of a fearful heart, "Be strong, fear not". Theirs it is to go about doing good as their Master did, finding people harassed and bewildered, perplexed and lonely, and succouring them in Christ's name. Having cast all their care upon God, they will not

be anxious about their own things, but be ever mindful of the things of others.

Their faith will be so strong that they will be able to restrain the hatred only too likely to arise in their own hearts, and to check it in the hearts of others. And if they are to keep untarnished the ideals with which Britain has entered upon war they must never forget it is not the German people we are fighting but the Nazi *régime* by which they have allowed themselves to be enslaved.

And if air warfare becomes *à outrance* it may be that some Christian non-combatants will be called upon to make the greatest witness of all—the sacrifice of life. Men die for peace on the field of battle; if Christ's men and women die for it when helping the needy, then indeed will their light shine. If great cities are bombed we hope that Cardinals and Archbishops, Moderators and Presidents, Principals and Editors, will be found at the post of danger with those prevented from seeking safety by duty or circumstance.

Most of all must Christians humbly confess, with penitence and shame, their responsibility for the condition of the world today. Even those who fought with all their might against the folly of Versailles have too often been slothful, intermittent, and faithless in their pursuit of peace. Is it not only too true that the Church of the Prince of Peace has failed to consecrate all her powers of mind and heart to the cause of peace? Often pacifists and non-pacifists have seemed more concerned to fight each other than to fight war. Therefore Christians cannot be self-righteous, priding themselves that they are not as other men; it is because they are pre-eminently the apostles of peace that they must take upon themselves the world's guilt for war.

Many who read these pages are pacifists, who believe that force cannot be cast out by force, that only by Christ's way, the way of non-resistance, can triumph over evil be secured. Others feel that there is no way of resisting and crushing a bully than by using the weapons he has chosen and which alone he understands. But all can unite in the resolve that when the war ceases, it shall not be ended by a peace imposed by force, and for that day all can prepare.

* * *

If most stress must be laid on the positive and direct contributions Christians can make to the world at the present time, that does not mean that the Church must not bear a corporate witness. In some ways 1939 has shown improvement on 1914; there has been little foolish boasting or flag-waving, and, so far as we know, none of the wild jingo utterances which disgraced some pulpits 25 years ago. And there is so far a readiness to respect the individual conscience which was not always evident in 1914.

In other ways now is much as then. Britain has started with the same glorious old muddle, with unnecessary air-raid warnings and firing on our own planes as well as with a stiffening of will resulting

from Nazi "frightfulness" (here the Germans, as ever, show themselves unutterably stupid and to have learnt nothing).

One other word must be said, and it will be one with which some readers will not agree. The political situation seems to us fraught with danger. While giving Mr. Chamberlain full credit for his sustained efforts to preserve peace, even the most enthusiastic "appeasers" have to acknowledge the complete failure of his policy. In the old days, when politics were politics, it was the custom for a Minister to resign when he had led his country astray, and it might have been well had Britain been led into war by a Prime Minister who had not so consistently proved to be wrong.

It is unnecessary to speak of the "ludicrous ineptitude" of the Government's policy; but it has to be recognized that, knowing nothing of foreign affairs, Mr. Chamberlain took charge of foreign policy, and that he was outwitted, out-thought, and out-manœuvred by three Dictators in turn. He, Sir John Simon (of Manchuria fame), and Sir Samuel Hoare (of Hoare-Laval fame) still control the Government which has to wage war. Can we trust Lord Halifax, who is generally respected, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Eden to ensure that (1) the Government prosecutes war more effectively than it sought peace; (2) the ideals for which the war is being waged will not be submerged? There will be different answers to that question. If the Government fail, it will not be able to lay the blame on the two Oppositions in Parliament, or upon the country, for never has a Government gone to war with a more solid backing. We shall hope for the best, and meanwhile urge all Christians, whatever their political affiliation, to be instant in prayer for those who have to bear an almost intolerable burden; they deserve and will receive the constant sympathy of all their countrymen.

It is unnecessary to remind our readers that all lovers of freedom must be ever vigilant in war-time, when freedom and truth are early casualties; otherwise even those fighting for freedom might find themselves enslaved. So while we are on our errands of mercy, comfort, and good cheer, let us be ever watchful. And may God in His mercy soon give the world peace and a chance we do not deserve to do better than we have done in the past.

* * *

It is to be hoped that the Government will make the fullest use of men and women with special knowledge and aptitudes. Mr. Harold Nicolson is a case in point. No man knows the diplomatic field better, as his *Marginal Comment* (Constable, 5s.), weekly articles contributed to *The Spectator* during this year, reminds us. The best brains of the country should be devoted to evolving the best methods of detaching the German people from their rulers and of strengthening Czech and Jewish internal opposition.

* * *

How memories of 1914 are revived in these terrible days—the same wild rumours, the same lies, the same atrocity stories and all the rest of war's ugly brood; the same snobbery and flaunting of a little brief authority; the same readiness of the young to respond to a high call, the same willingness of the poor to help the poor, the same keen sense of comradeship. Here are two evacuation experiences:

A Bethnal Green Centre.

Mother to grubby little boy: "Give the man a sweetie". "The man", not unknown to readers of these pages, as he watches the child fumbling in a bag which looks as if it has contained bacon and boot polish mixed, wonders how he can escape and dispose of the gift. His problem is solved by the mother: "Put it into the man's mouth, dearie"!

A "County" Receiving Station.

Lady in Charge: I really can't do anything else until I've powdered my nose.

Lady Escort: I've so much to do that although I feel grubby I can't bother.

Lady in Charge: Oh, it doesn't matter about you, but it's quite different for me. When you live here and are a cut above the farmers you must keep your position and appearance. . . . It's more important still when you are actually working with red-faced farmers' wives like to-day. You can't be on a level with them and must make the distinction clear.

* * *

Ministers and deacons of churches in evacuated areas are having a particularly difficult time, and need all the support churches more happily situated can give. When all the members of the teaching profession have departed, when many of a London church's finest workers are now domiciled in Torquay or Weston, Aberystwyth or Exeter, the burden on those left is heavy indeed. County and National Unions will need to exercise all their ingenuity to cope with an unprecedented situation; their best brains should be concentrated on finding means whereby channels may be opened for help to flow from the more prosperous parts of the country to those from which life has temporarily ebbed. Every effort should be made to give adequate expression to the fact that the Congregational churches are one family, and that if one member suffers all the others suffer with it. In some cases it may be necessary to bring up all reserves to hold a strategic post. Whitefield's Tabernacle, for example, near the new University centre and ringed round by hostels of various kinds, should renew its palmiest days of usefulness when war passes away. The opportunities there for a new type of ministry which will present a Christian apologetic to youth and set out to help them in all their

problems are incalculable. It would be good policy there, not merely to hold the fort now, but to prepare a staff of four or five ready for the new day.

* * *

THE repercussions of recent events on the churches and on the country will sometimes be unexpected. Some people are of opinion that the process started by the ruthless hand of war will be continued in peace-time, and that the transference of many large business-houses and insurance offices from London heralds the beginning of a contraction which has long been deemed desirable. Meanwhile the comments of working men and women left to toil in areas which may become very dangerous while their employers have sought safety needs to be noted; they will one day bear certain and maybe salutary fruit.

* * *

ONE of Herr Hitler's minor achievements is to bring the London Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of England and Wales together under one roof: it has taken a European War to effect what should have been accomplished decades ago. A step forward has been taken towards a fusion which has long been inevitable; the sooner it is consummated the better, for today waste is criminal. The next step is the amalgamation of the Livingstone and Independent Presses, which should have been reached ere this as a matter of policy, and not left to come about as a surrender to economic pressure.

* * *

THE effect of the war on this and all other journals remains to be seen. We hope that we shall be enabled, both by the steadiness of our subscribers and by the paper situation, to carry on as usual. We are glad to report that the National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States is subscribing for the next twelve months for all members of the "Committee of One Hundred" in charge of the arrangements for the International Congregational Council. We commend to our readers Dr. Douglas Horton's article describing his voyage round the world preparatory to taking up the Secretaryship of the National Council.

* * *

HERE is an intelligent American correspondent's reaction to last quarter's editorial commendation of Mr. Clarence K. Streit's *Union Now*:

> I laughed loudly and merrily at Clarence K. Streit's *Union Now*. Great Britain has everything to gain by such a union; we, nothing. Besides, as peoples neither you nor we have done anything to warrant our ruling the world. We haven't such good social conditions as Sweden or Denmark, our education is inferior to all the Teutonic States, we haven't the music of Germany, Italy, and France, we aren't so clean as the Scandinavians and Germans. We talk beautifully, and so have a nice literature; we are good-humoured but lack-a-daisical; we

like ourselves—we love ourselves; but we must look very ordinary as a people to God—very selfish, stupid, confused, and greedy. And *we* are to save the rest of the world—why, we can't even give decent lives to millions of people within our own confines, and for the sake of economic exploitation control millions of people in other countries.

* * *

At a time when the British Medical Association seems determined to discredit the medical profession in the eyes of the masses of the people it is well to have as an antidote Sir George Newman's *The Building of a Nation's Health* (Macmillan, 21s.). Sir George has not only been one of the most distinguished—and one of the most successful—of Civil Servants; he has also rendered to the Society of Friends, of which he is a member, much sterling service on the literary side. The present volume, based on his long experience at the Ministry of Health, is a mine of information which the social worker will find indispensable. After surveying the history of medicine in England preceding the establishment of the Ministry of Health, Sir George goes on to discuss such subjects as the School Medical Services, Special Schools, Physical Education, Mother and Infant, Nutrition, the Industrial Worker, Health Insurance, *etc.* A final chapter pays a tribute to Sir Robert Morant. It is impossible to do more than indicate the contents of the book. Every page sets the reader thinking; we note that in 32 years there have been 15 Presidents of the Board of Education; in 20 years 10 Ministers of Health. This suggests how much power, how much of the direction of policy, lies in the hands of permanent officials. Would that all medical men had ever in mind Osler's three personal ideals, which Sir George quotes—

> . . . . to do the day's work well and not to bother about to-morrow . . . . to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, towards my professional brethren, and towards the patients committed to my care . . . . to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humiliation, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

* * *

Mr. J. Middleton Murry may—though we doubt it—have solved his personal problem by taking Orders in the Church of England, but the problem he presents to his readers remains. Books pour forth from his pen one after the other. And here is part of the trouble; Mr. Murry writes far too easily; sometimes he writes lucidly; always—or almost always—he has something to say; but word-spinning is a snare; and when Mr. Murry is let loose on the Marxian terminology it is like a foggy fifth of November.

> The moral dynamic of European civilization has been the constant endeavour to insinuate the heteronomous requirement of the ethico-political into the collectivity.

Mr. Murry is represented by two books this quarter, *The Price of Leadership* (S.C.M., 5s.) and *The Defence of Democracy* (Cape, 10s. 6d.). In the latter Mr. Murry says that democracy failed in the blockade and at Versailles, committing an "unprecedented sin unique in history" (an example of the extravagance of which Mr. Murry is sometimes guilty). It can only recover if it learns to stand for responsible freedom, and that can be secured not through Marxian Socialism, but only through Christianity—and it is for the Church—"the democracy within the democracy"—and the parson to show the way. Mr. Murry analyses the teaching of Marx and shows where it fails: he does well to emphasize both that

> the dynamic that achieved democracy was, in the main, a dynamic not of interest but of morality and religion,

and that

> Membership of a democracy is a Christian vocation [and if democracy does not] advance towards a fuller realization of responsible freedom it will relapse . . . towards authoritarianism.

In the first book he asks whether the Church is prepared to accept "costing" ideas, in order, in Pope Gregory's words,

> to subjugate the world to Christianity by the instrumentality of the spirit which renounces the world.

Influenced by the two Arnolds, Thomas and Matthew, Mr. Murry surveys the world from the village school to the totalitarian State. The chapter headings may serve to outline the course of the argument: The Ladders to Leadership, Piety and Plutocracy, The Ruling-Class, God and the Nation, Supernational and Supernatural, The Christian Society, The Resurrection of Christianity, and The Judgment of Democracy. He seems to think that the National Government will never be defeated, but that Britain will work out a democratic-totalitarian compromise. Drastic educational reform should incorporate the public schools into the country's educational system, so that the ruling class will be constantly replenished by those in whom social responsibility based on Christian belief has been inculcated. Such education is the solution of our problems, for it is well to remember that

> The fearful situation in Europe to-day is in part the consequence of Mr. Lloyd George's inadequate education.

We hope that some day the Congregational Union will devote an entire Assembly to the subject of education.

* * *

DIARIES have of late been much to the fore, and we are glad to have Vol. II. of *Kilvert's Diary* (Cape, 12s. 6d.), Vol. I. of which was noticed in our October issue last year. The present volume covers the period from August, 1871, to May, 1874, during which Kilvert relinquishes the curacy of Clyro, where in seven years he had evidently won the affections of adults and children alike, and settles with his father in Wiltshire. In these years the animosity against Dissenters is not so violent, but we have much emotion expended on the beauty of little girls and much about a thwarted love affair. Kilvert had no mean descriptive gift, whether of nature ("every branch and twig stood out clear against the glow and the two twin sister silver birches leaned towards each other and kissed each other in the dusk"), or of events—murders, executions, dreams. The state of the Church of England is revealed in many passages, though surely there can have been few churches where the clerk could declare that for baptisms "the last parson never used no water. He spit into his hand"; in another parish the Archdeacon has great difficulty in making the clerk understand his inquiry how many times Holy Communion is celebrated in a year, but finally gets the reply, " 'Aw, we do never have he. We've got no tackling".

Kilvert seems to have taken a serious view of his calling, though his father doubted his wisdom in giving lectures which brought girls and their sweethearts out at night. What the lectures were about is scarcely indicated by the entry of a "satisfactory lecture" in January, 1873—

> I spoke about Noah's vineyard and drunkenness, The Tower of Babel, Babylon and the confusion of tongues, the Tongue Tower, the death of the Emperor Napoleon III and the Great Coram Street Murder.

This seems to lack nothing but a few words about infant baptism.

Sometimes Kilvert gives us a humorous picture of which he himself seems to be unconscious.

> I preached in some discomfort for although the Vicar had assured me the pulpit would be almost up to my chin it was scarcely above my waist, and in order to see to read my sermon I was obliged to crouch down in it and lie on one side on the ledge and stick one leg out behind.

The final volume of the Diary, to be published next year, is assured of a warm welcome.

* * *

PERHAPS we may be allowed to steal a couple of lines just to remind readers of the result of the County Cricket Championship for 1939, and especially those domiciled in Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, and Essex, who were good enough to write to us on red-letter days in the history of their counties.

A CONGREGATIONALIST LOOKS AT THE WORLD.

By Dr. DOUGLAS HORTON,
General Secretary of the Congregational Churches of the U.S.A.

THE Hawaiian Islands are said to be one of the few places on the earth's surface in which the visitor is never disappointed. Certain it is that a visitor who is interested in the possibilty of Christian co-operation among the world's races finds the Islands fascinating, for here, under the aegis of a free government, Hawaiians, Filipinos, Japanese, Chinese, and Americans from the United States live together with remarkable sympathy for one another and a minimum of friction.

The happy relationships one finds here are due in no small part to the Christian influences which have been at work on the Islands since first Congregational missionaries from New England set foot there. In recent years the development of the great sugar and pine-apple plantations, with the attendant influx of labour from the mainland of Asia and the other islands of the Pacific, has brought about an unexpected increase in the number of the non-Christian population; but the Christians of the Islands, through the indigenous Hawaiian Board of Missions, are responding to the needs arising from this situation with admirable heroism. The American Board has long since withdrawn from the field.

When one crosses to Japan he finds a nation which is a family. In theory the Emperor and Empress are the spiritual father and mother of the entire Japanese household : in fact to-day they are never separated from the sombre chaperonage of the representatives of the military party. "And how much power does the Imperial Family actually enjoy?" I asked of a man in a position to know. "A little less than it did under the Tokugawa shogunate", said he. But though the power of Emperor is reduced almost to nothing, he and his consort still remain the symbol of the unity of the Japanese people.

Though one begins to believe, after encountering expressions of the philosophy of militarism in every newspaper, magazine, and public speech which is translated to him, that the entire Japanese nation adheres to it, now and then in conversations with friends one is made aware that liberalism is not dead in Japan but is simply driven out of sight for the time being. There are still potent influences in that country serving to temper the remorseless belief in force fostered by the group now ruling.

Japan probably offers the best contemporary example of the totalitarian State. For centuries its people have been trained to respect

social authority; and to-day, when that authority is directed not as it was formerly to the aggrandisement of the nobility but largely to the amelioration of the condition of the people themselves, it is hardly surprising that the people are quite willing to acknowledge in their National Way a certain divine leading.

From this point of view it is understandable that the people as a whole look upon the invasion of China as an incident in a holy war. It is so evident to them that their government is the best possible of all governments that it follows that in the long run China can only be benefited by coming under the administration of Tokyo.

The peculiar monistic patriotism generally characteristic of Japan makes the study of its relation to Christianity as interesting as it makes the practice of Christianity (as we know it in the democracies) difficult. Recent legislation has given Christianity a standing with Shinto and Buddhism that it has never enjoyed before, but it is not that of a Church within a free State. Though the State allows the Church ample latitude within the boundaries of its own administration, there is no doubt as to what the more rigid patriots believe the chief loyalty of every citizen should be. They regard the State not merely as a divine institution, as is symbolized by the myth of the descent of the Emperor from the Sun, but as the supreme divine institution.

Fortunately for Christians, not all Japanese patriots—not even all those in the government—hold to this extreme point of view. It is safe to say that though all acknowledge divinity in the State not all regard it as sheer and unshareable. Other institutions may have the favouring hand of God upon them, as well. A place is therefore made for loyalty to Christ and His Church; and though the Christian will feel an undeniable tension between his loyalty to the supra-national body which is Christ's Church and that which he gives to his nation, it is not a tension of a divisive and unendurable character.

Generally speaking, Japanese Christians find it not inconsistent with their faith to assemble at Shinto shrines on patriotic days or to bow before the portraits of the Emperor and Empress. On the occasion on which I first addressed a Japanese audience—at the Doshisha University in Kyoto—I was aware, when I rose to begin my speech, that the audience was making a deep bow to me. I thereupon made a deep bow to the audience—and I followed their lead when they all turned in the direction of the imperial palace in Tokyo and bowed once more. Said my guide to me afterwards, "The bowing in the shrines and before the portraits of the Emperor and Empress means no more than the bowing of the audience to you or your bowing to the audience. It is an act of respect, not of religious devotion. We have quite a different feeling as we perform such an act from that which we have when we open our hearts to God in prayer".

Quite different is the interpretation of the act in Japanese-con-

trolled Korea. Here the problem is complicated by a secondary nationalism. Like the Japanese, the Koreans have believed that there is something holy in their loyalty to their own country. To bow before the symbols of Japanese government and to recognize Shinto, the national religion of Japan, is to the Korean not only to forswear his national allegiance but to deny the God whose spirit he and his fathers have felt in that allegiance. Tension between Church loyalty and national loyalty may be bearable, since God may speak through both, but the strain which is caused by the forced substitution of one national loyalty for another held sacred is not tension but torture, as any ordinary Korean, if he knows you are his friend, will tell you.

The administration of Korean towns and counties being now largely in the hands of local magistrates, there are almost as many customary ways of treating the Korean Christian groups as there are magistrates. One hears, at the one extreme, of the official who insists that before every celebration of the holy communion the Christian community appear for an act of dedication at the local Shinto shrine —a confusion of the things that are God's with the things that are Cæsar's which would not be dreamed of or tolerated in Japan proper— and on the other hand one knows there are Japanese office-holders of such sympathy and understanding that the local people find no fault with them whatever, save that they are Japanese.

In Manchuria the task of Japonization is only at its beginnings, but by comparing the policy of the imperial government in that country with what is being done in Korea, one gets a view of the total long-term plan. The great need in these countries from the Japanese point of view is for native leaders who are truly loyal to Japan. Since in the first generation after conquest it is hardly to be expected that such leaders can be developed in colleges and universities dominated by any but Japanese influences, the colonial policy is to make it virtually impossible for Manchurian youth (as it has also been for Korean youth) to acquire any kind of higher education in institutions which do not fly the colours of Japan. It is for this reason that the British and American medical and other professional schools connected with the missions are to-day labouring under rapidly increasing restrictions. Conversations with senior Japanese officials in the department of education lead me to believe, however, that these restrictions are only temporary. After a new generation has come up through the primary and secondary schools, which are or will be so thoroughly Japonized that loyalty to Japan on the part of the scholars may be taken for granted, the imperial government will be glad to see colleges of all sorts established for the professional training of the graduates of the lower schools. The government will accept these institutions, whether they be under Christian or non-Christian auspices, as freely as it does their counterparts in Japan proper to-day.

By looking across the Wall to Manchuria and Korea the missionaries in Northern China may anticipate what is in store for the populations they are serving. As long as Japan remains in control of the northern provinces, the Chinese of the cities may expect a far more systematic educational system than they have ever known before. That it will have a complete Japanese orientation is made evident by the regulations imposed on the schools already established. In the mission schools in Peking, for instance, officials appointed to the task have examined all the books in the library and have burned or otherwise destroyed all those that seemed to contain "dangerous thoughts". This process has involved the destruction of most of the books in the primary and secondary schools which reflected a liberal philosophy. On certain days the scholars have had to participate in ceremonies extolling Japan's prowess. One can imagine—or cannot quite imagine—the excruciating quality of the rancour felt by Chinese children compelled to march in parades celebrating Japanese victories in which their own fathers and brothers have lost their lives. It is hardly strange that when the scholars have returned from the parades they have in some schools accustomed themselves to throwing down the flags they have carried and trampling them under foot.

The Christian institutions of higher learning in Japanese China have not yet felt the repressive hand of the government to the same degree as the primary and secondary schools. The purely Chinese colleges no longer exist. Missionary institutions have each had to accept one or two Japanese professors as members of their faculties; and the latter, though selected by the colleges and universities themselves, are responsible to the Japanese authorities. The next steps to be taken by the government are awaited with apprehension, for it is clear that a liberal Christian education is impossible in any country in process of being Japonized.

It is the Japanese hope for China, however, as for Korea and Manchuria, that the day will come, after Japanese public education has been made universal and the Chinese by that process have become spiritual members of the Japanese Empire, when it will be possible to open higher educational opportunities of all sorts to the Chinese.

In China as in Japan we were asked frequently what prospect there was from the point of view of the United States, where uncensored news was available, for an early cessation of hostilities. To questions of this nature we could give no satisfactory answer at the time, but our observations of the two countries involved in the struggle leave us with one dominant impression, or possibly two. The first is that both countries are bound to lose by this war. They have already lost wealth of incalculable magnitude. Whether or not Japan will retain her grip on the northern provinces, finally compelling the immense agricultural areas untouched by railroad lines to capitulate

to her, is a question no person can answer to-day. There are no signs of immediate economic failure either in Japan or Chiang-Kai-Shek's China. Both sides can apparently carry on at the present *tempo* for an indefinite period. Our second impression is that it will be a long war.

Meanwhile, the missionary enterprise in China is faced with opportunities such as have never been known before. By the acid test of adversity the missionaries have been tried and not found wanting. When necessary they have stayed by the Chinese compelled to remain in Japanese China, and have stood between them and the invader. When necessary they have picked up their belongings and trekked with the Chinese into the remote areas of free China, there to re-establish their institutions for the Chinese again. There is no doubt in the minds of the Chinese that the missionary has come to the country because he loves the Chinese and believes in their future—and they are ready as never before to be interested in the pearl of great price which the missionary brings.

The lesson of the present episode in Eastern Asia (as Japan now prefers to call that part of the world which, in the day when Europe was the centre of things, was called the *Far* East) is not lost on the Philippine Islands. Time was, not so long ago, when the unanimous voice of the Islands was lifted in behalf of independence; but to-day the fate that may overtake weak independent sovereignties is only too evident. Furthermore, now that the United States Congress has actually voted that the Islands shall be given their absolute freedom in the year 1946, according to the psychological law that one is likely to prize most that which he is in most danger of losing, the economic blessings which have been brought by free trade with the United States begin to loom large in the public thought. It is probable that some type of treaty will be entered into before the Islands cut themselves loose which will establish for them the advantages of close co-operation with the United States without denying them the values of freedom. Some formula will be discovered which will give the Islands a relationship corresponding to dominion status in the British Empire.

Nowhere in the world did we find such "joy in religion" as in communities on the Island of Mindanao, the southern member of the archipelago. The Roman Catholicism which has dominated the Islands for the last 300 years is of a peculiarly backward and superstitious variety. Since the American occupation, the Church of Rome has been sending there a number of priests trained in American seminaries, and with them has come enlightenment, but the Church they represent is not, even at its best, a teacher of freedom. The general feeling remains in the Philippines as in Mexico that the Roman Church is more interested in itself than in the people. The new Protestant Churches, however, which are concerned with nothing

so much as revealing to the people how they may make direct and saving contact with God without loss of their soul-freedom, have brought to many a small town a veritable religious revival.

The tithing service in the village of Jimenez—I shall carry it for ever in my memory! The people there do not see as much money in a whole year as passes through the hands of an ordinary Englishman or American in ten days, but at the appointed time the members of the congregation of the little church rose, went forward, solemnly deposited a tenth of their week's pitifully small earnings on the communion table, and stood in a semi-circle around the table for a few minutes while the minister offered a prayer of blessing. The man sitting next to me whispered descriptions of the various people who stood there—this woman the wife of a ne'er-do-well husband with nine children, that one a young lawyer trying to develop a *clientèle* in a circle of villages round about, this one a young man just beginning work on a neighbouring coconut plantation, and so on. The scene was moving beyond words, and chiefly because of the sheer joy depicted on the faces of those who participated. The tithe was a privilege: to pay it was to make some small return to Christ for what He had done for them: they and He were members of the same company: they were engaged together in a business which reached into eternity. One felt that if only that same spirit could be imparted to our churches of the West the whole human race would begin to enter into a day of deliverance.

India is so huge a country—in contrast, for instance, to the Philippine Islands—and events of such magnitude have been happening there in the last decade, that it is impossible to characterize in a few sentences the situation one found there.

The areas which have been under the administration of representatives of the Congress Party have been governed, as even the Party's enemies are willing to admit, remarkably well. Men already prominent in their professions have in many cases relinquished large annual stipends to take up this administrative work as a service to their country. The Party is still animated by the missionary enthusiasm which is likely to be found in an idealistic movement in its early days.

The Party is not, however, friendly to Christianity in India. Being the religion of the English, it seems un-Indian, foreign. It is taken for granted that those who adhere to one of the older Indian faiths, and in especial to Hinduism, will be found to be more patriotic. Moreover, under the present constitution, according to which the various religious communities vote as political units, it becomes necessary for the Congress Party, which is virtually the Hindu community organized for political action, to see to it that the passing of populations from Hinduism to Christianity is held to a minimum, lest its own political power be sapped. It is for this reason that Mr.

Gandhi, who is still the heart and brains of the Party, looks with utmost disfavour upon mass movements to Christianity.

While an appointment was being arranged for my wife and me to see Mr. Gandhi, it was intimated by several friends that we should be doing Christian missions in India a service if we entirely gave up the idea of seeing the *Mahatma*: I was told that he had his secretaries present at every interview with Christians and that the conversation was guided in such a way that the report of it by the secretaries in the *Harijan*, Mr. Gandhi's organ, was such as to discredit the Christian enterprise in the mind of the readers.

It was because of these warnings (though I was not quite convinced by them) that at the interview itself I did not broach a discussion of missionary work in India. Instead, I began by asking Gandhiji (as his Indian friends call him) about his day of quiet. He gave us the interesting information that he began the custom purely as a practical measure—in order to shut out intruders from the hours he had set apart for writing. "Now, however", he said, "it has become a spiritual necessity with me: I could not go through any week without the quiet day and not feel spiritually undernourished."

At the Madras Conference one of the questions most keenly debated was as to the proper education for missionaries, especially for missionaries to India. Both Indians and others seemed to feel that some drastic change was called for, since missionaries tend to develop the mind which looks at India through the eyes of the mission rather than one which looks at the mission through the eyes of India. I therefore asked Gandhiji, without mentioning the missionary implications, what procedure he would advise a young westerner to follow for his first two years in India in order to acquire something of the Indian mind. "Send him for the first year by all means to Tagore's *ashram*; and if he has any cleverness with his hands, send him to me at Wardha for the second year", he said; and it is indeed hard to conceive any better education in things Indian, past and present, than would be received in such a way.

Tagore, however, is an aged man, and Gandhi is no longer young, though we were amazed to see how fit he looked. He fairly radiated good health. None the less, the advice he gave will be good only for a few years. India must find new spiritual leadership. We were sorry not to be able to meet Jawaharlal Nehru.

In spite of what is felt by the Hindus about mass movements to Christianity, these movements seemed to us to be the most interesting religious phenomenon observable in India to-day. When I was younger I thought of conversion as so intimately personal a matter that "mass conversion" seemed a contradiction in terms. In the contemporary mass movements in the villages of India, however, due regard is given to the necessity for individual decision. It is

clearer to me than it was formerly, also, that social forces have their perfect part to play both in bringing an individual to the point of decision and in sustaining him in it afterward. It is in this respect that the mass-movement approach in missionary work represents sound modern sociology. Formerly an individual who became a Christian had to leave his community—an act which cut him off from opportunities both to marry and to make a living among his own kind. He became almost inevitably an economic dependent of the mission. To-day, however, in the mass-movement areas, an individual who desires to be baptized is advised to devote himself to evangelism among his neighbours until his village is ready to take the step with him. By this means he himself remains a part of the society that has sustained him from his infancy and his village offers the missionary a chance to educate it systematically in the social as well as the individual implications of the Gospel. The baptism of an entire community of people whose eyes are lighted by a faith they had not known before Christianity came to them is a sight, we can testify, not to be forgotten.

After coming from India, where the twisting of the British lion's tail is something of a national pastime, we were surprised to find so much enthusiasm for the Empire expressed by the people of Egypt. In the Egypt of yesterday which we knew, there had been no such friendliness. The reasons for the change in sentiment are, however, sufficiently obvious. The Italian seizure of Abyssinia has opened the eyes of the Egyptians. They have become aware that there can be no such thing as entire independence for any small nation in north-eastern Africa. They must therefore choose the most favourable alliance—and since Britain is now willing to give them almost complete internal autonomy and able further to offer them the protection of the imperial army and navy, not to mention the advantages of empire trade, they are quite ready to throw in their lot with the other dominions on which the sun never sets.

The missionary problem of Egypt is the problem of Islam—and this we were to continue to encounter through Syria, Irak, and Turkey. At the great general missionary conferences, such as that held at Madras, the Moslem question is likely to be neglected because of its comparative difficulty. Though Protestant Christian missionaries have been at work in Moslem areas for over a century, their progress has been negligible, if the making of converts is regarded as the criterion of success. In Egypt, for instance, though several hundred Christians, coming chiefly from the Coptic Church, accept Islam every year on account of the political advantages involved, less than 100 converts have been won to Christianity during the entire period of Protestant endeavour in that country—"and I wouldn't trust most of *them* around the corner", commented one missionary. It is indeed difficult to recall one spiritually powerful

man among the number—a Kagawa, a Sadhu Sundar Singh—or even half a Kagawa.

One reason for the futility of the Christian effort in the Near East is the bad record of Christianity in the past. The Crusades left a historical memory of cruelty and bigotry which a hundred years of Protestant ministries have been unable to wipe out. Again, non-Protestant Christianity is a sorry sight in the Near East. The churches, with their highly ornate interiors, crowded with representations and relics of saints, seem possessed of a hundred more superstitions than the Moslem congregations worshipping in their architecturally chaste sanctuaries, which invite unencumbered prayer. And the patent—I was going to say blatant—competition between the churches is a scandal. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem it is notorious that the priests of the Roman, Coptic, Orthodox, Gregorian, and Abyssinian Churches glare at each other as they approach the altars assigned them. I have wondered whether, if I had visited that church in my early youth, I could ever have espoused organized religion. If that church represents the end result of that Catholicism in which the Church as the Church, right or wrong, dominates the devotion of its adherents, I am glad to belong to the company of Catholic Congregationalists who, for the very reason that they love the Church, never cease critically to compare it in its visible manifestations to the perfections of its invisible prototype.

The Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was surrounded by barbed-wire entanglements, and in the square in front of it British troops were drilling. A large armoured car almost blocked entrance to the main door. To such days we have come.

We were surprised to find so many British troops in Palestine. It was whispered that they had been sent there in great numbers not because of the local need but because in the event of a general European war they would be conveniently near to the Suez Canal and to Egypt. All the missionaries, British and American, with whom we talked semed to be unanimous as to the solution of the Arab-Jewish conflict: said one, "On the day that Jewish immigration is suspended, tension will begin to relax and hostilities to diminish". It is apparent that the Jews can help the Arabs and the Arabs the Jews. They complement each other economically. The Jews bring in capital and new agricultural methods from the West. The Arabs provide an almost inexhaustible labour market, and are possessed of a real eagerness to learn. Culturally the two groups cannot but find each other's presence stimulating. Given these facts, the chief necessity seems to be that the populations should be held in balance—and the country well policed by neutral forces like the British until the ground has been laid for co-operation between the two parties.

We found Syria in the throes of political travail. It is felt by

the Syrians that the French have not carried out their treaty obligations. Here, as elsewhere, political independence is the great desideratum. It can be hoped that some such relationship may be worked out between this country and France as is now enjoyed by Egypt and Great Britain.

The Christian Church here represents a picture similar to that seen in other countries of the Near East. The Moslems remain Moslems. The priests of the highly formalistic native Christian Church—in this case the Maronite— look with suspicion and sometimes with anger upon Protestant missions, for they are aware that most of the members of the latter have been recruited from their own ranks. To-day there is more of reciprocity and good-neighbourliness between the old and the new Churches than there was formerly. This is perhaps especially true of the Armenian Gregorian and the Armenian Evangelical Churches—but there is as yet little that could be called, even by the most imaginative, co-operation.

The influx of Evangelical Armenians into Syria from Mustafa Kemal Pasha's Turkey has given new quickening to the Protestant Church here. The larger missionary institutions, being under the joint auspices of American Presbyterians and Congregationalists, and the missionary forces in general being in full co-operation with one another, the native Churches, Armenian and Syrian, have constantly before them a summoning example of Christian comity.

In Irak we again discovered unexpectedly friendly feelings towards Great Britain. The people we talked with, however, were from Basra and the maritime area to the south-east, where the advantages of international commerce are recognized, and where there is a growing disposition to cultivate business relations with the British trader. Up-country in Baghdad and its hinterland there is far more of the nationalist spirit. There the foreigner is seen only in the *rôle* of exploiter. To the average Arab farmer in the north-west half of the country Great Britain is probably regarded as the political embodiment of Shaitan.

Irak is one of the countries controlled by the Shiite Moslems, the narrowest of all the larger schools of Islam. And again, Christian progress measured in terms of converts is mugatory. The ministries of the Christian Church through its schools and hospitals, however, as in other countries of the Near East, have been an incalculable blessing to the people.

It is when one reaches Turkey, where explicit formal religious instruction and common worship are forbidden by law, that one has a remarkable opportunity to study the Gospel reduced to its lowest terms and to ask himself how that Gospel may best be introduced to the Moslem Levant—for it must be understood that though Islam has been eliminated from Turkey as an organized religion, the social *mores* that remain are nothing if not Moslem. I think the question

Christian missionaries to Islam must put to themselves is this: Can the content of the Gospel be put into Moslem forms? Of course no one who recites the creed, "There is no God but Allah and Muhammed is the prophet of Allah", as an expression of his belief in the religious uniqueness of Muhammed as the only revealer of God can be considered a potential Christian; but if by the creed one means that Muhammed is *a* prophet—*the* prophet in certain spheres—then an opening is made for Christianity. Specifically, if a Moslem desires in the *la ilaha* only to witness to his adherence to Islam as a historical and social entity, which is indeed the only form of Islam not frowned upon by the Turkish government to-day, what is to prevent him from finding in the Gospel a relation to God which will condition but not destroy his allegiance to Islam? Can there be no such person as a Moslem Christian—a person whose horizontal relationships are Moslem and his vertical relationship Christian?

The best proof that Moslem Christianity may exist is the fact that it does exist. One of the most interesting interviews I had in the Near East was with a group of Moslems who have invented for themselves the title, "Jesusists". They are still Moslems, pursuing all the practices of a liberal Moslem way of life, but they accept Jesus as the divine revealer of God's love. It is in His name that they gather weekly for prayer-meetings—some of these lasting far into the night—and it is in His name that they trust that their movement will grow until the whole of Islam is leavened by it.

For the present government of Turkey one has few words that are not spoken in admiration. If one is ready to admit that democracy is possible only among a well-educated people, then one must salute the present Turkish *régime* as the best possible under the circumstances. Certain it is that the leaders have wrought magnificently on behalf of the people. The religious restrictions are harsh and exacting; but it is clear that if the old reactionary Moslem groups were allowed to come into power again they would destroy the present government without ado. At first the government was equally antagonistic to all forms of organized religion. Roman Catholicism and all other Christian groups with political connexions disappeared. Congregationalism, however, remained—in the institutions which the American Board had established there. The schools and clinics stayed open, though religious teaching as such was not allowed within their walls. The government has come to see to-day that there is such a thing as a religious organization which exists not for itself but for the benefit of the community in which it is placed—and more and more co-operation is taking shape between the Congregational institutions and the government itself.

It is possible to envisage the day when, under the inspiration of the lives lived by Christians in these institutions, a Christian movement within Islam will have gathered way and the age-old deadlock

between Christianity and the religion of Muhammed will at last have been resolved.

The most interesting religious phenomenon we saw in Greece was the *Zoe* or Life Movement. A group of laymen in the Orthodox Greek Church, having discovered the Bible, are the leaders of a revival of religious life within the formalistic old Church which threatens to move it to its foundations. They at present enjoy the hesitant approval of the hierarchy, though the prime mover has been arraigned before a church court for heterodox teaching on two different occasions. They are allowed to preach in certain churches after the morning masses are over—and the floor of those churches is crowded with standing worshippers eager to hear the Good News. By this means and by Sunday School work, all under the administration of volunteers, the members of the *Zoe* group hope for a revitalization of religion in Greece. And the more headway that movement makes, the closer will be the day of co-operation with the Evangelical Churches of the country.

The first sentence, or almost the first sentence, we heard on arrival in Prague, ten days after Bohemia had been made a protectorate of the German Reich, was "We are in the hands of robbers". Already the men of Jewish extraction had been told that their services would no longer be required in the business of the city, and they had begun to walk the streets, with nothing but starvation or charity to face in the long future. It was their children for whom they were most concerned. The inexpressible tragedy of it! Two parents, having never seen us before, but knowing only that we were Christians from America, brought us their children, begging that we should take them away with us—anywhere!

In Germany we talked with liberals who feel that while the Confessional Movement has taken a worthy stand in denying the right of the government to dominate life, the theology of the movement is not such as to give it longevity in the present day. Some of them believe that a kind of Congregationalism which by its very distrust of episcopacy and other types of connexional polity delivers itself from political ambitions is the hope of to-morrow's Germany. They call for a free Church, powerful in the spirit, which will reach Germany not from its political side but at its soul. Readers of the *Congregational Quarterly* have already been made acquainted with this conviction through Dr. Karl Börnhausen's article. It is one which should have an important place in the deliberations of the International Congregational Council next year.

SUGGESTIONS FROM KARL BARTH.

By Campbell N. Moody, M.A., D.D.

It is not very difficult to sum up the teaching of Karl Barth. It could almost be put in the single sentence, "All is of God". Man was created in the image of God; but by his rebellion against the Sovereign Will the image has been not merely defaced, but annihilated, so that man cannot do so much as seek God. In his religion he does not draw near; on the contrary, he sets up a barrier between himself and his Maker by his self-willed grasping after truth, his futile doing in place of believing, his creation of gods, and his efforts to propitiate them with "work-righteousness", that is to say, with his own goodness of heart and of conduct, and with his religious performances. In his commentary on *Romans* Barth represents religion in its *essence,* not exactly as sin, but as the first step towards sin, because direct union is lost when man and his Creator cease to look on one another face to face, and man begins to bow in worship. Apart from this, Barth regards man's religion in practice as unbelief, a rejection of God's way.

There remains between God and man no point of contact: the point of contact must be created by God Himself. He reveals Himself by condemning man, and in condemning He bestows His grace. It is for man to listen and not to speak, to receive and not to do, to let God intercede with God, and to abandon his obstinate and helpless striving. In general,

> man can only be present at God's revelation in every respect, as the servant is present at the action of his lord, following, obeying, imitating, serving (*Dogmatik,* I. i. 491).

All is of God, and the faith whereby man receives the revelation is God's gift. Barth dislikes the suggestion, which naturally occurs to the reader of St. Paul and the Gospels, that there is at least a *negative* preparation for the grace of the Most High in weakness, poverty, foolishness, and lowly estate. It is an interesting point, more especially in the light of experience on the modern mission field. It ought to be remembered that men are accustomed to assume that the rich, and especially the wise, have an advantage over others in the pursuit of religious knowledge, and that part of what Paul, at any rate, announces is that they have no such advantage; "*not many* wise after the flesh", he says, "are called". Barth, however, is apt to trample down a troublesome suggestion rather than to deal with it patiently. And he will not have it said that in Jeremiah, Moses, Isaiah, Jonah, or Saul of Tarsus there was any preparatory fitness for the Divine Call.

Barth never grows weary of reminding the reader that in Salvation, or in the Revelation which is Reconciliation, man does nothing and God does everything. Barth could have accomplished more by compressing his books, especially the double first volume of his *Dogmatik*, to a quarter of their present bulk, or even less. What, however, I wish now to point out is that the interest of his work does not lie solely, or for some readers chiefly, in the enunciation of central familiar, but often neglected truth, or in his discussions of such doctrines as that of the Trinity, where he can say little that is new. From time to time he makes fresh and profound remarks on less central themes; and even when they are not wholly fresh, they are put in a striking fashion, and deserve more attention than they receive.

In regard to Scripture, Barth, in practice, is conservative in his views, and often writes as if nothing had been touched by criticism. In theory, however, he is very far from holding to the inerrancy of the Old Testament or of the New; indeed he makes capital out of the "offence" of the Bible. In his audacious style he piles up the difficulties which face the modern student. The Biblical authors, he avers, spoke the language of the world around them, and in their way of looking at things were often so like their neighbours and contemporaries as to be almost indistinguishable. All that they say appears to be divested of its character as witness to Revelation when "parallels" can be found in Pagan literature. And much in the Bible does not belong to religion or theology, as we understand it, but to profane legislation, history, proverbial wisdom, and poetry.

There are distinctions of higher and lower stages in the Bible; and the numerous authors write from the most varied situations, and with no unity of mental outlook. They contradict one another, as perhaps in the case of Law and Prophets, the Synoptics and *John*, *James* and Paul. And they are self-contradictory; for not one author has brought his thoughts into a self-consistent whole. Since they are human beings it could not be otherwise. But how can one deny that all these imperfections constitute a stumbling-block, not to be set aside, or not to be set aside except in Faith?

Here comes the miracle. It would be no miracle, but a kind of magic (*doketism*) if Prophets and Apostles who were not real and therefore *erring* men were to speak God's word. But

> that the lame walk, the blind see, the dead rise, that sinful and erring men speak the word of God, this is the miracle of which we talk when we say that the Bible is God's word (*Dogm.*, I. ii. 587).

To Barth the greatest offence of all is that the Bible is, from cover to cover, a Jewish book, written by Jews about Jews, and concerning a Jewish Messiah. And we are bidden not merely to take an interest in Jewish history and affairs, but, in a decisive sense, to become

Jews! Barth writes two or three striking pages on the Jews in this connexion; but we pass to his remarks on the aim of Biblical study.

In a writer who enlarges again and again on the *Word of God*, we are not surprised to find a good deal regarding the exposition of that Word as contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Thus he reminds us, forcibly enough, that when anyone addresses us we do not inquire why, or in what circumstances he is doing so, or what is his appearance and his history, or what is the grammatical structure of his sentences. First, and principally, we wish to know *what* he is saying.

Barth's observation may be applied, for example, to the study of a Pauline Epistle. The chief concern ought to be to ascertain what Paul says and means. It may be a good thing to learn of his Jewish upbringing, of the teaching which he imbibed from Gamaliel, of his Greek surroundings in Tarsus, and of parallels to his utterances that may be met with in the literature of Jew and Gentile; but anyone who reads the Bible ought primarily to desire to know *what* it says; and anyone who reads the Apostle for the sake of Revelation must wish most of all for a share of the spirit with which the writer was filled. This becomes difficult if attention is drawn exclusively or predominantly to subsidiary matters.

Barth makes the further observation that when we are dealing with God's Word we cannot get beyond or behind the texts of Scripture. Research into a History of Israel behind the Bible story, or a Life of Christ behind the records of the Gospels, or an Apostolic History behind *Acts* and the Epistles, may be undertaken at his own risk, and perhaps with no great gain, by anyone who has a taste for antiquarian study. But to treat the antiquarian interest as if it were *the* interest is, even from the "purely scientific" point of view, a scandal. Call off the foolish hunt, cries Barth, for historical truth above Scripture, and make a re-direction of aim; seek the understanding of the Revelation to which the documents bear witness (*Dogm.*, I. ii. 545-8).

It must be noticed that even those authors who take pains to discover what instruction the Gospels and Epistles sought to impart to their contemporaries, and how it was understood by them, often appear to be quite indifferent to the spiritual needs of the present time. They invite us to the tent of the Bedouin Abraham; they help us to see his mode of life and to guess at his religious thought; but they make small effort to ensure that we shall be heirs of his faith. They try to transport us to the Apostolic Age, and suppose their aim achieved if the Rabbi Paul appears before us with a mind remote from ours, while the inconsistencies and crudities of his arguments stare us in the face; but, as if religion were no concern of theirs, they leave it to us to discover whether the Apostle has anything to say to ourselves.

It was to show what message St. Paul had for our time that Barth wrote his book on *Romans*. A commentary it is not, and the lessons are far-fetched. Yet the aim was good; and it is high time that commentators and writers in general abandoned the "purely scientific" study of the New Testament which has been the bane of much modern literature. It is amazing that Christians can be content to produce books "dry as dust" on spiritual themes.

It cannot be said that Barth has succeeded in bringing men back to the Bible. At every turn he lays stress upon the Sovereign Will and Lordship of God, and upon the demand for man's obedience; and this he does with a harsh emphasis that is foreign both to the Old Testament and to the New. This harshness is a strange appearance in our age, and it blinds both Barth and Brunner to much that is good, especially to that marvellous outpouring of the spirit of love by which the Christian world has been transformed during the last hundred years. Barth insists that even when mercy is revealed in judgment, nothing is put into man's hand; God's gift is only lent to the Christian, who does not attain to "a firm disposition of soul," but in himself is just

> the same talented and excitable, or untalented and inactive person that he was as an unbeliever, and may again become.

Never put into possession of anything, he does but attain to "comforted despair". In the opening volume of his huge work on Systematic Theology (*Dogm.*, I. i. 253) Barth is constrained to acknowledge that no affirmation can be too strong, no hyperbole excessive, in regard to Christ's dwelling in the believer, so that he becomes one with his Lord. Yet the prevailing tone is not that of the justified who *stands* in grace and boasts in the hope of the glory of God. And Barth so dearly loves cautions and trembling that his teaching can scarcely fail to prove unwholesome and perilous for timorous souls.

He has little interest in the wealth of Scripture, in its great variety of experience, of teaching, and of doctrine, which bewilders the systematic thinker, but fits the requirements of men in their various stages and phases of experience. Barth delights in paradox; but the Bible is not all paradox. The Revelation in which God judges and condemns the sinner, and, in condemning, pardons him, may be the central truth of the Gospel, but it is not its only truth. Reconciliation, or, as Barth and Brunner would say, the Revelation which *is* Reconciliation, Forgiveness, and Justification, is not the sole disclosure. There are multitudes of genuine Christians to whom, at some period in their lives at least, forgiveness is relatively insignificant, and "grace" is an antique term. They make no demur to the assertion that God "draws out" and develops the good in human nature. What they prize is the assurance that Christ is their Companion and Leader, or that He helps them in their struggle with

temptation and their endeavour after a Christian life. Their experience of Revelation is of something that is quite simple and direct, and reminds them of the compassion of an earthly father, or the kindness of a friend.

For Barth the Revelation is not simple and direct. On the contrary, it is only by hiding Himself that God is able to reveal Himself. Barth takes for illustration a sermon by Luther on the Syrophoenician woman. She has heard the good report about Christ; but when she comes in faith she meets with a rebuff. She presses on in faith and wins just when Christ makes the case darkest. So, says Luther, when God reminds us of our sins, and brings us to despair, we plead His grace for sinners and are at peace.

Nothing pleases Barth better than to point out that when God has said "No" to all man's wisdom, efforts, attainments, goodness, and religion, it is then, and then only, that His grace is bestowed: it is then that man hears His "Yes". God reveals Himself by concealment, and in no other way could He reveal Himself. The Incarnation is the supreme example. God could not come to earth directly as He is. He veils Himself in what is *not* God, namely in the form of a man. But this is not all: He moves on earth *incognito*; for there is much in the life of Jesus that may easily prove a stumbling-block, and Barth goes so far as to allege that, "judged by the record, His sinlessness can be as easily denied as ours can." Yet the veiling of God in this form may prove to be His unveiling. The glory of God may become revealed in Jesus. It is revealed to the eye of faith.

In his commentary on *Romans* (Eng. transl., 98-9) Barth quotes a notable passage from Kierkegaard which has an intimate bearing upon this theme. "Remove from the Christian Religion", he says,

> as Christendom has done, its ability to shock, and Christianity, by becoming a direct communication, is altogether destroyed. It then becomes a tiny superficial thing, capable neither of inflicting deep wounds nor of healing them; by discovering an unreal and merely human compassion, it forgets the qualitative distinction between man and God.

This saying is profoundly true; and its admonition is greatly needed at a time when Christianity is too much regarded as a consolation or anodyne, and the analogy of human and family relationships, for example, of father and child, is unduly pressed in spiritual things, to the exclusion of the profound mystery in which the ways of the Unsearchable God are veiled. The ways of God are not as the ways of man, but are, at the most central point of Revelation, opposed to commonsense. This indeed we learn from two or three sayings of our Lord, and from several passages in the Epistles, notably the first and second chapters of *I Cor.*

Barth points out that the worldly form in which the Divine content is veiled is no unlucky accident; it is not something that can ever be

got rid of. There must always be *two sides* in the revelation; and no human power can ever bring them to a unity, so that we may grasp as one whole the worldly form and the Divine truth that is hid in it, or, to express it more simply, the picture and the truth embodied in it; but we pass from the first to the second and back to the first again, and there is no abiding. The veiling becomes an unveiling; and again, but this is less obvious, the unveiling becomes a veiling. Illustration may help us to grasp what Barth means. As we contemplate the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels we become aware that we are in the presence of God, and we exclaim, This is the Son of God. On the other hand, as we read the Fourth Gospel we become aware that the Word, the Son of God, is before our eyes in human form (veiled); He is Jesus.

We move from the letter to the spirit, and from the spirit back to the letter. As our failure in the performance of duty comes before us, we are confronted with God's Law, and are filled with despondency and shame, until we remember the Grace of God for sinners. Law and Grace, God's Wrath and His Mercy, says Barth, His Command and His Promise, are by turns disclosed to us. It is by turns only; for we cannot in one moment hear the Covenant of *Exodus* and the New Covenant of *Jeremiah*. The Prophets are *either* all threat or all promise.

We do not get the Word of God in the worldly, or earthly form without the content, nor yet in the content alone without the form.

> God leads us now through form to content, and now through content back to form, and in both cases to Himself,

and so does not give Himself into our hand, but keeps us in His. It is very important to observe this, and not to give up the *indirectness* in revelation, which means the giving up of Faith, as it did in the history of Roman Catholic and Protestant theology. We need faith for the return from the triumph of faith, the return from finding to seeking, from being within to being without, from having to asking, from the triumph of experience and thought to honest and complete spiritual poverty. We do not climb to the heights and dwell there, after the manner of the mystic. The mystic would have nothing of the concealment. But the victorious believer goes back to the Word as it is *veiled* in preaching, in the Bible, in Jesus: he does not become independent of the earthly form; nor does he move from victory to greater victory, or from joy to greater joy; but is ever and anon led back by God Himself (*Dogm.*, I. i. 174-187; *Word of God*, 192-204).

It is in such movement that the soul lives and has Christian experience. And, indeed, we derive encouragement from the perception that this is God's mysterious way of dealing with His chosen. Barth does not say so, and it is not his wont to speak cheer to the

"trembling" child of God. Yet now and then he does administer comfort in his own peculiar fashion. None but a true Christian, he observes, would seek God and welcome His gifts. What gifts? The disclosure of Divine Lordship, and of human poverty, emptiness, and rebellion, such a disclosure, in fact, as drives the man out of his home in himself, and thrusts him on his Substitute. No more is he permitted his favourite idol-worship and trust in his own character and conduct; he is forced to confess himself an unprofitable servant. Grace keeps him down; it lays bare the wildness and indolence which cling to his best thoughts and endeavours. Who would seek such gifts? Who but a child of God? For him they are not bitter, but sweet (*Dogm.* I. ii. 433).

Prof. John Macmurray is always worth reading and his "Study in the Philosophy of Psychology", *The Boundaries of Science* (Faber, 7s. 6d.), is as acute and ingenious as anything he has written. Science, he shows, as part of human behaviour, is part of its own subject-matter. "There is nothing that science cannot give us some knowledge about, and there is nothing that science can give us complete knowledge about". Prof. MacMurray discusses the paradoxes and antinomies to which this leads, illustrating especially from psychotherapy.

> The attempt to provide a psychological account of psychology leads us into antinomies. It leads to theories of human behaviour which, if they were true, would make the production of scientific psychology impossible.

The clue to the problem lies in the recognition that scientific knowledge is but a limited and dependent kind of knowledge—"instrumental knowledge, or knowledge of the World as Means". In arguing to this conclusion (see "Worth Noting") Prof. Macmurray has some wise things to say, among which may be noted his reference to the oft-forgotten fact that most, if not all, of our unconscious behaviour is the result of the formation of habits.

Mr. Jack Lindsay disarms his critics by saying that his *Short History of Culture* (Gollancz, 15s.) is summarized from a much larger work, the fruit of 20 years' study, and that he purposes to deal at length with other phases of the subject. And in any case the book is difficult to review; it is at one and the same time scrappy and suggestive; irritating by running an economic thesis to death and pleasing by its abundant and happy citations and translations; strangely proportioned ("The fool" having 14 pp. and "Art up to the Present" 2 pp.), with a bibliography which scarcely inspires confidence and yet with an enthusiasm that appeals. Readers will learn much from this book, and if they believe the Soviet Union is "yearly increasing in prosperity, power, freedom, and cultural exuberance", showing

> the constructive mass-forces pressing towards peace and plenty under a leadership based on the scientific understanding of social change,

they will no doubt regard Mr. Lindsay as a prophet indeed.

THE STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT AS I HAVE KNOWN IT.

By Dr. W. B. Selbie.

In the autumn of this year the Student Movement is to celebrate its Jubilee. It will be an occasion for recollection, thanksgiving, and re-dedication. The story of these fifty years is one of struggle, conflict, and achievement, and it confronts the rising generation to-day with an unexampled opportunity. It is not my purpose here to tell the story over again. This has been done once for all and most admirably by Tissington Tatlow in the history of the Movement which he wrote a few years ago. It is a wonderful and inspiring record and of it all Tatlow might well say *Quorum pars magna fui.* For the Movement owes an incalculable debt to the faith, courage, devotion, and statesmanship of this one man, who, as secretary, has shaped its fortunes during the greater part of these fifty years and still lives to be its guide, philosopher, and friend. What I hope to do therefore is simply to give some impressions of the work of the Movement as I have known it and to indicate the outstanding importance of the contribution it has made and is still capable of making to the work of the Kingdom of God.

My first contact with the Movement was a visit from Tatlow when I was a minister at Highgate. He was going the round of some of the younger ministers in London trying to enlist their interest and support, and he had been sent to me by Silvester Horne. I must confess that I was at first not altogether sympathetic. I had seen something at Oxford of what might be regarded as the beginning of a Christian Union among students and had not been greatly attracted. It was a loose association of earnest and rather ignorant young men led by extreme Anglican evangelicals. Their work consisted in holding prayer-meetings and open-air meetings and in distributing rather lurid tracts. They were strongly fundamentalist and would have nothing to do with those who did not accept the full verbal inerrancy of the Scriptures. I soon discovered, however, that the Student Movement, as Tatlow envisaged it, was to be built on broader lines. While thoroughly evangelical in spirit and aim it has always stood for complete freedom of thought, and for the study of the Bible with all the aids that modern scholarship can provide. This has led to difficulties, even in some places to the setting up of rival societies with a definitely fundamentalist basis. But the Movement has always refused to tie itself down in this way. As at present constituted, its doors are open to all Christians and its only condition of membership is a "desire to understand the Christian faith and to live the Christian

life". This broadly Christian basis is the secret of the attraction which the Movement has always had for the more intellectual type of student, though it has undoubtedly repelled some.

It was not until I had moved to Cambridge that I came into close association with the work. While there, and afterwards at Oxford, I attended summer conferences at Matlock, Baslow, Conishead, and Swanwick, and kept up the practice for nearly twenty years. I also saw a good deal of the work in the two older Universities and paid visits to Christian Unions in the Universities of London, Bristol, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Aberdeen. Of the value of these contacts with student life and thought I cannot speak too highly. They certainly taught me much and made me, I hope, more understanding and sympathetic in dealing with the peculiar needs and difficulties of the younger generation.

This brings me to the first point I would emphasize in connexion with the work of the Movement—the very real contribution it has made to the cause of Christian unity. *Ut omnes unum sint* has been the motto of the students from the first. All their activities have been on an interdenominational basis, and their outlook has been catholic in the best sense of that much abused term. While Churches, Conferences, and Commissions have been debating the subject of Reunion almost *ad nauseam* the Student Movement has given to the world a most convincing demonstration of unity in action. It has brought together men and women of all denominations, and of none, and enabled them to pray and work in common, forgetting their differences in their loyalty to the Kingdom of God and of His Christ. No one has ever been asked to be disloyal to his own Church, nor has there been any attempt at proselytizing. But there has always been kept before men's minds the vision of a Christianity greater than any of the Churches and wide enough to include them all. If, as has sometimes been suggested, the Movement has not always lived up to its ideals and has made concessions to the stiffnecked, as, *e.g.*, in the matter of intercommunion, it has only been in order to ensure the co-operation of all denominations and of all parties in the Church of England. And this has by no means been an easy task. Indeed, the story of the difficulties which the leaders of the Movement had to face in its early years is now almost incredible. There were Evangelicals who declined to be associated with those who did not share their views on the Bible and Anglo-Catholics who would have nothing to do with an organization in which they might meet with so-called Christians who were not of the Anglican fold. It must be remembered, of course, that fifty years ago any co-operation between the different sections of the Church was a new thing and still viewed with a good deal of suspicion. This became very manifest when the S.C.M. tried to set up a Theological College department. It took some years of patient educational work to bring

these Colleges into line. If the *odium theologicum* has not been quite killed it has certainly been discredited. That a more friendly spirit exists among all the Churches to-day, and a greater readiness to co-operate, is largely due to the fact that many of their leaders came to know and respect one another during their student days. The greatest obstacles to Christian union are ignorance and isolation, and the Churches owe a great debt to the S.C.M. for bringing together Christians of all sorts, helping them to know and understand one another, and making them feel that they have a common cause and are dedicated to a common service. Work of this kind is still greatly needed in view of the curious recrudescence of sectarian feeling and theological intolerance which has recently come about. Corporate reunion seems as far off as ever, and most of us are tired of trying to discover some general formula which all may accept as a basis of union because it is colourless and commits no one to anything. Far better that each Church or denomination should give its distinctive witness so long as it allows others to do the same and recognizes that all alike have a contribution to make to the common Christian stock. The Student Movement has shown, better perhaps than any other organization, that on such terms as these united Christian worship and service can be both feasible and fruitful. The students at least recognize the fact that there are diversities of gifts and of operations. They will not suffer the blurring of differences or the ape-ing of one another. They try to understand the other man's point of view and would never say to him or imply, "I am holier than thou", or, "If you do not agree with me you cannot be a Christian". In these matters the Churches would do well to take a leaf out of their book.

The next and perhaps most notable contribution of the S.C.M. is its work for foreign missions. The Movement was indeed cradled in missionary enthusiasm. In its early years it owed much to Keswick, Henry Drummond, and the Cambridge Seven, and the inspiration thus derived has lasted to the present day. The Student Volunteer Missionary Union (S.V.M.U.) was an integral part of its organization from the first, and its early motto, "The Evangelization of the world in this generation", was a challenge not only to the Colleges but to the Churches. The Movement not only served as a recruiting ground for the foreign field but it also helped to set the whole question of world evangelization in a new perspective and to bring home to the Churches their responsibility in this matter. It is the business of students to study, and the Movement has never been slow to provide them with material. Missionary study circles have become part of the routine work of the S.C.M. and have contributed not a little to the spread of knowledge and the increase of zeal as well as to obtaining a more intelligent grasp of the missionary problem as a whole. All over the world there are men and women

working in connexion with the Missionary Societies of all the Protestant Churches whose first call came to them through the Student Movement, and the number of them is being added to year by year.

Though the main interest of the S.C.M. has always been evangelistic, it has not neglected either the intellectual expression of the Christian message or its social implications. Indeed, it has sometimes been suggested that these more exciting and pressing subjects have tended to overshadow the simple preaching of the Gospel and the cultivation of the devout life. This is only very partially true and is quite accounted for by the fact that the work of the Movement is in the hands of very young persons who easily tend to over-enthusiasm and who are not exempt from the common human frailty of only being able to see one thing at a time. It is true that at one period in its history the Movement did seem to over-emphasize the social and economic implications of the Christian message. But this was only because the subject had been grievously neglected in the Churches, and there was great need to redress the balance. Here again the Movement has done excellent work in acquainting young men and women with the darker side of our civilization and in bringing home to them the responsibility of Christians for creating and advocating a new and juster social, political, and economic order.

The same is true on the intellectual side. The S.C.M. has made a very real contribution to Christian apologetic and to the popularizing of a positive Christian theology. Very early in its career the need for handbooks and textbooks in all departments of its work became imperative. Most of the literature available was either of the goody-goody sort or too technical and scholastic. The Movement therefore set itself to fill this gap and to provide, mainly for use in study circles, a new kind of Christian literature, both scholarly and edifying, critical and positive. From these beginnings grew up the S.C.M. publishing department which has now become a great business enterprise, is responsible for the Religious Book Club, and has made some first-class contributions to Christian scholarship. It has also produced a number of invaluable handbooks on almost every aspect of Christian thought and life. While the work of the department has had in view mainly the needs and problems of students it has also proved a very welcome addition to the intellectual armoury of the whole Christian Church.

So far I have spoken of the Student Movement as though it were confined to Great Britain, whereas it is really world wide. Oxford and Cambridge men are as a rule naïvely parochial in their outlook, and those who only know these older Universities have very little idea of the vastness of the student problem as a whole. One of the greatest services which the S.C.M. has rendered has been to bring together men and women from all the Universities and Train-

ing Colleges, enabling them to know one another and realize their common interests and responsibilities as Christians. From this it is but a short step to bringing in students from foreign lands, and facing the fact that the problem is as wide as the world. From the beginning the Movement in this country has been in fairly close touch with that in America and much help and guidance has been given by men like J. R. Mott and Robert Wilder. These men were deeply interested in the missionary aspect of the Movement and realized how vast a field for Christian witness and service was to be found in the student population of the world. So the World Student Christian Federation came into being and exists to-day the most hopeful and efficient international organization for the promotion of peace and goodwill. It seeks to bring together the youth of all nations and to unite them in a common service, and it looks forward to the time when wars and rumours of wars will cease and the federation of mankind become a reality.

As the Movement grew in numbers and expanded in usefulness fresh problems presented themselves. One of the most difficult and insistent was that of the relation of students and ex-students to the organized Churches. There were long and anxious discussions on the subject, and they had at least one practical result in the formation of what is known as the S.C.M. Auxiliary. This is an organization in various districts of past members of Christian Unions with a view to keeping them together and enlisting them in the service of the Churches and of good works in general. As might be expected, its success has only been partial and sporadic. It is even suggested that the Auxiliary tends in places to become a rival to the Church rather than a helper. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that its main service is in supplying senior helpers to the work of the S.C.M. in general, and that it leaves the question of the relation of ex-members of the S.C.M. to the Churches very much where it was. Of the paramount importance of this question there can be no two opinions, and it is very necessary to get it in its right perspective.

It is sometimes suggested, for example, that if all that stream of young life and energy which flows forth from the Student Movement in the Colleges year by year were drafted into the Churches it would put a very different complexion on them and their work. Now it is certainly true that the Movement has not helped the Churches as it hoped to do and as it might have done. But it has given some very valuable and much needed help. I have already spoken of the way in which it has stimulated missionary interest and provided recruits for the foreign mission field. Much the same is true of the home ministry. In all the Churches there are ministers and lay workers who owe both impulse and direction to their contacts with the Movement in their student days. But it has to be admitted that these are exceptions and that the great bulk of Christian students hold very

loosely by the Churches, if they are not actively hostile to them. The situation is very bluntly put in the following extract from a report on the question of the Auxiliary :

> A very considerable number of gone-down Student Movement men and women had honestly and sincerely tried to enter the service of some branch of the Christian Church; many of them had failed to find that Church a fellowship at all : some in despair had severed themselves from organized Christianity altogether while others were grimly sticking to it in spiritual loneliness and depression : one and all longed for the fellowship they had known in the Movement, some indeed looking to the Movement still as the one thing they trusted.

So we constantly find students asking what they are to make of the family Church,

> with its obscurantist parson, its antipathy to its next-door neighbour in the way of churches, and its fear of the new moral issues which social life presents.

The obvious answer is that those who feel like this should take up work in the Church and help it to do better. The fact that they seldom do so, and that they are not always welcomed when they do, constitutes our problem. It is a problem not peculiar to the Student Movement but shared by all *extra*-Church associations such as Keswick, the Oxford Groups, and the Anglican and Free Church Fellowships. Such gatherings of like-minded men and women, with their rather rarefied atmosphere, their easy mutual intercourse and exchange of ideas, and their deeply devotional tone, constitute an experience such as is not often to be met with in the Churches and makes their ordinary work and worship seem rather tame. Yet it is quite futile to think that one can build a tabernacle on the Mount and stay there for ever. So it is nonsense to say, "How easy it would be to be a Christian if life were one long Swanwick camp". For it is never easy to be a Christian. The Christian life is not just a series of ecstatic experiences but hard spade work in Sunday Schools and slums, mission stations, and the like. The Student Movement teaches this clearly enough and has as one of its main objects the preparation of young men and women for a life of Christian service. The obvious arena for such service is the Church. Why then is it not made better use of? No doubt there are faults on both sides. Young people are apt to be exacting, superior, and too much in a hurry. Many churches are very conservative and look with suspicion on new ideas and methods. The students criticize the churches because they fail to find in them the easy camaraderie and intellectual keenness and rather hot-house devotionalism to which they are accustomed in places like Swanwick. The churches on their part do not always give these young people credit for being so much in earnest. They are all anxious and willing, as they say, to cater for the young, but that too

often means merely providing them with amusements or a literary society or opportunities for sport. These are all very well, but there are not a few young people who regard them as an offer of stones instead of bread. They want a stake in the church itself that they may find in it a spiritual fellowship which is at once a means of grace and an opportunity of service. Students need the Church, for only in and through the Church can they rightly fulfil their vows of loyalty to Christ the great Head of the Church. And the Churches need the students—their energy, their open-mindedness, and their consuming zeal. It would be a good thing if clergy and ministers generally would take occasion of the Jubilee of the S.C.M. to study its story afresh. It is a truly remarkable record and it points the way to the only possible solution of the perennial problem of Youth and the Church. It makes quite clear that what is needed is such an intensification of passion for the great ends for which Churches and Student Movements all alike exist as will melt away the natural differences and antagonisms of young and old and weld them together in the common fellowship and service of the Kingdom of God.

No account of the Student Movement would be adequate that did not make some reference to personnel and to the work of individuals. From the first it has attracted to its service a very fine type of man—and woman. Here again it has been in advance of many of the Churches in putting women on an equality with men and giving them their full share both in administration and witness. The leadership of women like Miss Rouse, Miss Fairfield, Miss de Selincourt, and Miss Sedgwick has been simply invaluable. Among the men mention may be made of Douglas Thornton, J. H. Oldham, William Paton, Bishop Talbot, and the present Archbishop of York, all of whom did much to direct the fortunes and shape the policy of the Movement. The same may be said of four men from Mansfield College, Frank Lenwood, Martyn Trafford, R. K. Evans, and Malcolm Spencer. But these are only a few among many. A glance at the long list of men and women who served their apprenticeship as secretaries of the S.C.M. shows them now continuing their service, many of them in positions of great influence and usefulness, in the Church and the mission field, in education and every form of social work. The Movement has indeed been a most fruitful recruiting ground for the service of both Church and State.

And it has also been a nursery for the Kingdom of Heaven. The leaders of the Movement, both senior and junior, have never lost sight of their evangelistic aim and purpose. They have sought to preach a gospel which is God's power unto salvation. But they have done this in the way best suited to the needs and mentality of the student world. All their apologetic, all their intellectual handling of religious problems, has been in order to commend the Gospel. They have taught students how to read their Bibles and how to pray, and

helped them to meet the difficulties and temptations incidental to their age and state. For it must always be remembered that students are a class by themselves. No doubt they represent the nation in epitome, especially in these days when their ranks are recruited from all sorts and conditions of men and women and from every class in the community. But at the same time they stand apart with interests and habits of their own. They have their own peculiar *ethos* and it is one that makes the religious approach to them exceedingly difficult. They are at a most impressionable age—neither children nor adults but something between the two. They are cocksure and self-reliant, but full of doubts and questionings, taking nothing for granted and very impatient of intellectual control. They want to prove all things but are not so sure about holding fast that which is good. Many of them are in a state of great moral confusion. But they are generous to a degree and eagerly respond to the right kind of appeal and guidance. The Student Movement has shown something like genius in its understanding of them and in adapting its methods to meet their needs. All the Churches owe a debt to the S.C.M. They may well thank God for the faith, hope, courage, and enterprise of these fifty years and unite in the prayer that the to-morrow may be as the yesterday, only much more abundant.

P. T. FORSYTH:
THE THEOLOGIAN FOR THE PRACTICAL MAN

By Markus Barth (Basel).

On the continent I have heard a whisper saying that all British theology is semi-pelagian in its nature. This accusation has been in my mind during my stay in this country since last October. The suspicion is that many British theologians, under the influence of philosophy, humanism, or other sources, have adopted a line of thought that excludes the justification of the sinner by the sole grace of God. They profess a doctrine of revelation which allows abundantly for natural theology and therefore is not essentially distinguished from that of the *"Deutsche Christen"* in Germany to-day. It was said, "If one allows any second standard of faith beside the Bible, why cannot the German blood and soil be this for a German believer as well as his natural goodness for the British? If the revelation of God in Jesus Christ is merely one among others, why should God not be revealed for some in Hitler's person and work? In the last resort the British semi-pelagian is virtually incapable of differentiating his faith from that of a 'German Christian' ". Is this true? The actual preaching in this country seems to me not such as to refute the suspicion. There is so much spoken of man's natural want of God, of his need and capacity for decision on the basis of rational considerations, and of an ethical task described as the "building of the kingdom of God". The stress in most sermons I have heard was laid upon the subjective, personal side of belief. British ministers are often concerned with practical faith exclusively, its objective ground being sorely neglected. That is because the British man in his deepest nature is the *practical* man, just as the German may have a trend to speculation and the Russian perhaps towards the mystical. However endowed by nature with certain national predilections, ministers of Christ are supposed to preach nothing but the Gospel of Christ. I do not deem it needful to believe that the practical man of Britain is by his nature farther from Evangelical theology than the German or Russian. Every natural man is as far as possible from it. The question at issue is solely how much he allows for his natural predilections, whether they are masters or servants of his thinking.

My impression is that a repristination of Augustinianism, historic Calvinism, or reformed Orthodoxy is scarcely the demand of the hour for this country. The practical man will never be satisfied by any mere rehash of an old dogmatical system. What he wants is an individual experience and knowledge of Christ. Christ must give the answers to his moral questions, must give all that the modern man of practical mind lacks.

I have read in recent weeks three books of P. T. Forsyth: *The Cruciality of the Cross* (1909), *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (1909), *The Work of Christ* (1910). Forsyth is the theologian the practical man needs! I cannot understand why his works are not much more widely read, why such a man of interdenominational importance is not installed as a teacher and herald in thousands of hearts. Is he forgotten because tied down to his era? Is he too hard to be read? Is he too theoretical? He must be a very narrow-minded and above all unpractical man who by such pretexts would cut himself off from so rich a source of good theology. Biblical theology is practical by its very being; it helps us to preach and to pray, and may keep us from going too much astray in faith and life. We desire good Christian instruction for individual life, religious experience, and the problems of the modern world? If so, the books of modern philosophers, psychologists, and moralists may be more safely neglected than those of P. T. Forsyth. It is worth while spending time on his works, for they give us a standard by which our own preaching and teaching may be judged.

I. FINALITY OF CHRIST.

The man practical by nature may of course be tempted first of all by the semi-pelagian error: he may incline to a religion of co-operation of God and man, to a syncretism mingling man's general religious feeling of a higher being called "God" with the revelation of the triune God in Jesus Christ. It is evident that we must deal with man where he is, that is to say with man who—we are told—never lacks some trace of true religion. Must we not appeal to that, and attempt to build up Christian faith upon that? However we have to solve the problem of a psychological approach, there cannot be any dealing with the ultimate issue unless we know what true religion means and what in it is final. Forsyth gives the incisive reply that Christ's work on the Cross is the only final fact in our religion. "The finality of Christ"—is this a phrase of Forsyth's own coining? I do not know. What does it mean? We are here concerned neither with the co-operation of God and man, nor with several revelations; there is but one truth and one work that matters in the Church—Christ's. We need not worry about man's capacity and willingness to build God's kingdom; this kingdom is already come unto earth, Christ Himself is the kingdom. How do we know that we are concerned with this kingdom? How can we see that it is a real kingdom in power, that the Christian religion is the only true one, and that its truth is final? We learn that solely by looking at Jesus Christ. There cannot be anything more ultimate than the coming of God's eternal Son to the world; there cannot be any work needed as complementary to the "finished work" of Christ on the Cross.

No doubt this truth was contained in the sermons I heard. But

there was always a second truth joined with it, another truth declared to be final as well as the first. Christ is the one side of our religion, it was said, but the other is *our coming to Christ*. Christ is being preached as the great teacher and prophet, who taught us finally how and what we are to obey. He is the embodiment of the will of God and we have to give heed to, and to decide for, this will. So man in his decision has become a second focus of the preaching; two finalities having been set up. Forsyth definitely points out that by so doing one seriously depreciates Christ's work and the meaning of His life. The Cross, he states, is not an object-lesson, but a final deed of God. Christ is not only the inaugurator of our decision, the guide to the right way; He is not only the beginner of our regeneration; much more is He, by His obedience, the sole true servant of God, the way; He is the new life because on the Cross He is that sacrifice of ours which God requires. Our preaching must be that God has redeemed us in Christ, not that He is willing to redeem. That Christ is the first-born among many brethren does not mean that He is the first in a succession of obedient men, the first exemplar of the process of becoming children of God, the noblest representative of a life in the truth of God; much more, His obedience was final, His life and death were the crisis, not the first step, in our regeneration. His Cross *is* the truth of God that is available for us, He effected our final salvation. Christ's incarnation means not that we now have a perfect prophet on earth, whom we are to follow in order to *be* reconciled, but it means that we *are* reconciled, that we *have* peace and a new life. Christ is the final truth—that means that His Cross is the final truth. "Christ is just what His Cross is".

But was Christ not a prophet all the same? Indeed He was, by His own preaching and that of His apostles. But that means not that Christ is inspiring and we are performing, and that both together constitute the Christian religion. It means that Christ's life and death was life and death *for us*. He not only offered *a* sacrifice; as fulfilling the Old Testament sacrifices, He Himself is *our* sacrifice; He secured not only an atonement and peace, but *our* atonement and our peace with God. His crucifixion is not only the death of a great martyr in the centre of human history; it is the erection of the Cross, that is to say, the revelation that our reconciliation has been made. Our justification and sanctification are not two things, the one happening once for all, the other a continuous process, but both are one and the same. To preach mainly a religion of the Sermon on the Mount and of the Prodigal Son is to suppress what is crucial in Christ's life: the Cross and its meaning. The fact that Christ is our prophet and priest by His Cross *mainly*, and by His teaching only secondarily—in so far as it is a commentary on His Cross—is the very core of the apostolic preaching. Is this core to be abandoned by making Christ no more than the greatest teacher of morals? Then the uniqueness of Christ

is abandoned, and the uniqueness of His Church, and Christianity becomes merely one religion among others. But the Cross is the final and only religious truth. Christ Himself established the apostles as His authoritative witnesses, He Himself made them preach the Cross and nothing else; we cannot get any final religious instruction except through reading the Gospels *and* the Epistles.

II. THE HOLINESS OF GOD.

What we have been saying seems far enough away from the interests of the practical man, who rather trusts his own conceptions of Christ than the apostles' insight. Certainly one prefers to think of God as loving Father than as anything else. God is preached as the consummation of the human affection called love. That God is *more* than our loving Father, that the Cross reveals Him as the Holy One, is seldom heard. The bearing of God's love on experience and ethics is plain, but is holiness irrelevant to them? Is the preaching of the Cross as the revelation of God's *holy* nature so unpractical? There is nothing more necessary for the Christian thinking of the practical man than to consider what God really is, rather than how we should like to imagine Him. Are we not all in danger of picturing God as such a one as we ourselves would probably be if we were God? But God is other than our sublimest self. He is the Holy One. This Forsyth brings out most clearly.

Holy is our God; that means He is not identical with our highest concept of love, goodness, fatherliness, lordship; but He is first of all Himself, free, eternal, omnipotent, unconceivable by the human mind. God is primarily Himself, the unapproachable majesty, inaccessible to human ideas and never tied down to them. It pleased this holy God to reveal Himself and to speak to man on earth, and what we know of the revealed Holiness of God is that "love is its outgoing, sin its defiance, grace its action on sin, the cross its victory, faith its worship". The revelation of sin, of its overcoming, and of our service of God, is inseparable from the holiness of God. The Cross is the "hinge of our religion", what God did not reveal there of His Holy Being is not revealed. And what does the Cross show? That we must fear the Lord and love Him, because He is the judge of our sin and its conqueror. That God's nature implies His love to us and requires ours to Him is abundantly declared on British soil; but how many know that His *holy* nature implies His judgment upon sin and requires that we fear Him? That does not mean that there is a struggle in God between His love and His justice, but it shows how different God's love is from ours; there is a holy love revealed by the holy judgment on the Cross. God cannot love sinners except by judging their sin. And we cannot worship and proclaim God except by fearing and loving God's holiness, out of which His fatherhood in love and judgment flows. The right relation of Law and Gospel, of

our fear and faith over against God, has been the subject of endless theological struggles in Germany. By developing the thesis that there is no rivalry in God between His attributes, *e.g.*, between His justice and His goodness, Forsyth might, if known, have been a landmark in the controversy and a pioneer towards its solution.

III. THE ATONEMENT.

In his doctrine of the atonement Forsyth brings home the action of God's holiness in loving and judging on the Cross. In *The Work of Christ* we move within the very centre of Forsyth's theological thinking, and here it is so concentrated, so full of biblical truth and genuine interpretation, that nobody can fail to study it without the greatest possible profit. Even to sketch it here would go beyond the limits of this article, and would be anything but a fair representation of Forsyth's well wrought arguments. I myself had much trouble in understanding his ideas, his language and logic not always being easy. I have read the pertinent part of *The Work of Christ* thrice and oftener—and it was worth while. I know a good many theories of the atonement, but I have found none of them as sound and biblical as the doctrine of Athanasius and Anselm. Yet Forsyth has something new on this subject, which makes more intelligible to modern man the death of our Saviour and its mystery. The doctrine of the atonement is as difficult as the mystery is great. An attempt to penetrate it will not be wasted time for any. Forsyth criticizes Anselm for forgetting the work of the Holy Spirit in the atonement. His attempt to see the atonement based in God's holiness, wrought out by Christ's obedience (that is by His perfect confession not so much of sin as of God's holiness), and appropriated to the race of sinners by the sinless Redeemer, throws a new light on the mystery. The mystery is not dissipated, profaned, rationalized, or otherwise desecrated, but there is an attempt to explain it as biblical truth ought to be explained to the modern man.

IV. THE MORALIZING OF DOGMA.

In dealing with the Atonement and other doctrines of the Church, Forsyth does not intend to allow the urgency of the dogma to be obscured. Neither does he merely replace old doctrines by new ones. But what he attempts to do is to make the fundamental truths of our religion intelligible to the man immersed in the practical life. Moralizing of the dogma means such a theological thinking as does not dissever doctrine and life by dealing with ethics only as the fruits of religion. Moralizing of the dogma means ethicizing religion itself, means considering the work of the Saviour not as philosophical but as experimental. Forsyth believes that theological truth as such is ethical truth. Soterology so becomes Soteriology, the dogma of the incarnation the ground of our forgiveness, the doctrine of the two

natures of Christ that of perfect communion of God and man. To speak of God's omnipotence is not an arbitrary philosophical speculation, but is a description of the freedom and the capacity of God to work His holy will on mankind. The pre-existence of Christ means that our Redeemer is a holy Redeemer, that the holy Son was required to reconcile the unholy to the Holy. Is it not true that the modern man, as well as the Westminster Confession, hopelessly labours to reconcile a philosophical doctrine of God's absoluteness with an ethical theology? Forsyth presents theology from the very outset as a moral truth, concerning history, life, and the individual step by step.

We need sermons pleading for an ethical creed, not an academic. We need a truth relevant to our experience. That is not to say we can or ought to make our experience the subject-matter of our preaching or the measure and source of our faith. Experience is a means and vehicle of the faith, but not its standard. Our faith is more; it deals with an objective fact, that is to say with the Cross. Experience has its limits (and that is what British theology may always have to learn from Continental), but there is a legitimate use of experience in religion. It often grasps far more than intelligence, it counts for more than apologetics; pietism was a real advance upon the later Protestant orthodoxy. But though possibly a good observer, experience can never be the thing observed by faith; it always remains a means. We must have in our faith more than experience—the knowledge not of our feeling, but of God's deed, of our salvation and new creation.

Perhaps one could ask if Forsyth's extensive appeal to experience really helps the clarity of his books. Perhaps—be it the experience of Christ, the apostles', or ours—Forsyth relies too much upon its evidential value. However, he did not go too far. The consciousness that our religion is the Christian Church's religion safeguards him from turning to an individualistic concept of faith. Salvation wrought out for the race is personal, but not individual. The Cross is there true and believed, where the Church is, and the Church is its trustee. A religion apart from the Church cannot prove its truth; the man in the street who holds aloof from the people of God and the preaching of God's word cannot judge the Christian dogma. So the experience of forgiveness and regeneration will always be experience of *our* forgiveness and regeneration. Life in justification and sanctification is life in the community of believers.

But the importance of the Cross is not confined to the Church. It holds the victory over all the world. Reconciliation is not only "once for all, for ever" but it is also "for the world". So Forsyth frankly ventures to consider and to judge all human relations through the Cross. Central to all human kindness, goodness, justice, freedom is definitely the Cross and not human conceptions. The answer to all

social and ethical problems, the judgment over all history and development is to be sought in the Cross. Is it only to be *sought* there? Nay, it is given there, and what we need is more trust in the universal relevance of the Cross, a deeper knowledge of its saving nature, and a greater boldness in preaching from the Cross, exclusively from the Cross. If the Cross is the final judgment of all humanism, so much the more is it the sign and the ground of the new humanity. The holiness of God condemns all human self-justification. But "the moral bankruptcy" of man before God's holiness "is the battlefield of Christianity". Our new creation is brought about in the same Christ, on the same Cross, that meant our condemnation.

V. BIBLICAL PREACHING.

We could continue to show how profoundly Forsyth dealt with other theological questions; there is nothing of moment in theology that he did not compass or touch in the three books above mentioned. Is it amazing that a man for whom Christ and Christ's Cross was the very centre of all Christian thinking and living has found answers that are worth more than dozens of other theological books? There is a mystery in P. T. Forsyth himself: whence did he get his thorough knowledge and insight, whence was he gifted to teach so dynamically and even finally as he did in some regards? He would be no practical man who did not ask for the sources of the riches of a fellow-man, especially when he enjoys him because owing a great debt to his teaching. There is but one answer: Forsyth's teaching is Christian and powerful because it is biblical teaching, it is gauged by the apostolic teaching. Of course Forsyth is a modern man through and through; he fills page after page in expressing his gratitude to modern scholarship, biblical, historical, and psychological. But by not idolizing modernism he makes it serve the great purpose to measure the Church's teaching and preaching by the Bible. That is because the Bible belongs for him to the "finished work" of Christ Himself, and is not only a commentary on it. And yet Forsyth is not a fundamentalist. He takes into account the relativity of the biblical authors' experiences, but he acknowledges them as the classic and authoritative witnesses of Christ crucified and explains this profoundly in *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. We have not to preach from our experience, from our morals, from our individuality, but from the Cross of Christ; and Forsyth's books intend solely to help the Church to recover a more powerful and true witness to Jesus Christ. *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind*—a book we have not mentioned till now—will help in his task any who is willing to draw from the theology of Forsyth the conclusions which vitally affect his own preaching and hearing of the word of God.

WHY AND WHEN DID JOHN MARK WRITE?

By W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D.

Euclid had not the attractive style of modern detective authors, scenting his way through a mass of facts fragrant with red herrings; he told his readers at the outset what he intended to prove. Barristers also, though their certainty may be less, do put clearly at the beginning what their case is. Following such precedents, the case to be argued now is: that John Mark conceived in Cyprus the idea of writing a book to show the appeal of Jesus to all men, especially Romans; that he returned home to the headquarters of the followers of Jesus, to think out his plan and choose his material; that he published his book shortly after the Council of Jerusalem, primarily for such Romans as congregated at the capitals of Caesarea, Antioch, Paphos.

Consider first the man, and his qualifications for such an undertaking. In his father's home, Jesus and the twelve disciples had supped during passover week; it had apparently been raided that night, and he himself had rushed away to warn of the danger. On the third night after, Jesus had there met ten of the disciples; a week later there he met eleven; for the next few weeks they "were abiding" at that upper room. Every glimpse of locality shows it as a leading centre of the growing fellowship. Some years later, when Peter escaped from Herod's prison, he went thither; and such an obvious refuge it was, where search would be made, that he left before daylight. Though the goodman of the house disappeared very early, his place was soon filled by Joseph Barnabas, brother of the goodwife, rich enough to own property near, generous enough to give it for the brotherhood. John Mark must have known every prominent person in the neighbouring community, from Cleopas of Emmaus to Joseph of Arimathea.

His double name hints at two sides to his training. "John" was Jewish; at Jerusalem he must have been soaked in Jewish life, seen perhaps at first from the standpoint of a lodging-house keeper, thriving by the crowds of pilgrims at the many festivals. His uncle Barnabas was a Levite, so that there was a link with the Temple, focus of the pilgrimages. But he was also named "Marcus", the prenomen of Mark Antony, of Marcus Agrippa, of a proconsul at Antioch. So there was some affinity with Roman officials, though he may not have been on visiting terms with Pilate or the military tribune at Antonio.

In the year of the crucifixion Mark was "a young man"; then after living under Herod Agrippa as king of Judea and Samaria, he became again a direct subject of the Romans under procurators at

Caesarea. About 14 or 17 years had elapsed, and Mark was in the prime of life, when his uncle opened new prospects to him.

The movement had spread to Caesarea, Cyrene, Cyprus, Antioch. This was the capital of the East, a trilingual city, residence of the proconsul, with a legion and a large staff of Romans. To this cosmopolitan centre came refugees from Jerusalem, Jews of Cyprus and Cyrene, who told of the new movement started by John the Baptist and widened by Jesus. In a great Hellenized population they found an opportunity not recognized hitherto, and did not confine themselves to Jews. Many Gentiles threw in their lot and trod "the Way", so that news came to Jerusalem of the remarkable development. The Mother-Church saw the fitness of Barnabas the Cypriot to investigate, and despatched him. He thoroughly approved, stayed on, and rescued from obscurity at Tarsus a Pharisaic convert, Saul, who had once headed a persecution that had hit Jerusalem very badly. For a year Barnabas shepherded the new group at this capital, implanting his spirit of generosity so that they sent help to the Mother-Church. With him on this errand he took his *protégé* Saul, who thus had an opportunity of showing true repentance for his past. Barnabas would of course stay with his nephew Mark, who had learned from the teaching and example of the Master to "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you".

When Barnabas had fulfilled his mission of beneficence, Mark took holiday from his duties as householder, and went with him to see for himself the remarkable developments at the capital. A new world opens at Calcutta for a man from Benares, at Alexandria for a man of Mecca. The novelty at Antioch important for Mark was a bazaar with shops of a new kind. There were stationers, there were books, there was probably a library, as there certainly was in Cyprus. Antiochus had brought to Syria the Greek love of letters. Though we know of no local Herodotus, at least the city had long ago produced a poet, Aulus Licinius Archias, who became involved in a lawsuit at Rome, when the speech of his barrister Cicero glances at the city's "most learned men and most liberal studies".

Despite the beginning made with Greek adherents, there was danger of mistaken ideas becoming rooted in the popular mind. Shallow wits had coined the title "Christians" for the followers of the Way. Good that it was recognized the Jews had found their Messiah; but it was only too probable that he would be regarded as an insurrectionary leader, a Mahdi. Of the real man Jesus, nothing much was known. Greeks were prone to assume some abstract idea, from which they would argue indefinitely, seldom stopping with Socrates to clear their thinking; but Latins, who were here on a scale new to a Judean, wanted plain facts. Polybius had written a massive history to explain why in a short 53 years Rome

had conquered the world: facts marshalled and recounted so as to explain progress. Facts about Jesus were needed here. When Peter had toured Palestine he could assume that at Caesarea, everybody, even Roman soldiers, had heard about Jesus; but at Antioch the man who for a few months, in Mark's youth and at about his present age, had flashed out on the rustic hills of a turbulent province, was not even a name. It was risky to leave such ignorance that even an officer in high command might get a wrong conception of the Way, and might connect it with an Egyptian stirring up to sedition, leading out into the wilderness 4,000 men of the Assassins.

Presently the work expanded dramatically. The Church at Antioch heard a call to despatch Barnabas and Saul on a mission. They started for Cyprus, and Mark prolonged his holiday to see this new departure. In Cyprus a new opportunity presented itself. The proconsul himself, Sergius Paulus, was interested and sent for the missionaries. Two important results followed swiftly. The proconsul was astonished at the teaching, and "believed". Imagine a governor in India giving credence and adhesion to a new sect! Doubtless this amazing success was connected with the other fact; it emerged that Saul of Tarsus had another string to his bow—he was a Roman citizen, for an ancestor had been adopted into the same family as the proconsul. The importance of this had apparently never dawned on Saul before, and it evidently enlarged his ideas. Hitherto he had thought in terms of Jerusalem, Damascus, Tarsus, and had shown no initiative; it had needed Barnabas to call him to Antioch, the Church there to send him to Cyprus. Now a vision of travel, of a mission to Roman capitals, seems to have taken hold, and he went on towards a second Antioch, capital of the province of Galatia to the north.

But Mark had not been commissioned for this roving, whether by the Holy Spirit or by the Church at Antioch. Indeed his immediate duty became clear; he was a member of the Mother-Church, which might reasonably expect to hear at first hand about the success of Barnabas both at Antioch and in Cyprus. He returned to Jerusalem, his home.

What was his next duty after reporting? He might well ponder in what exact way he might spread the good news, which was proving so welcome to Romans, military and civil. Jeremiah had had a similar problem, and had had the inspiration to write a book which should record the substance of his messages at Jerusalem. Was he, Mark, called to use a man's pen as a new tool to serve his Lord? Jesus had severely blamed a servant who had only one talent, and in timidity had done nothing with it; he must try and trade for his master. Now a rich Jew of Alexandria, Philo, after a lifetime of authorship, had just written an account of his embassy to the emperor. One group of his writings has been characterized as "An

exposition of the Mosaic Law for Gentiles"; it included biographies of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph; he had also written a life of Moses as legislator. Since this biography had been used to commend Judaism to the Greeks, and may have helped to win proselytes, surely the life of Jesus had something in it which it was essential Romans should know, as explaining the Way to which he summoned his followers. Philo had published scores of books, surely Mark might try with one.

What was the central point of all? "That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve". Such was a summary of what the Church at Damascus had delivered to Saul, of what he was soon to concentrate upon, whatever he had done before. Now of these events, Mark had been an eye-witness; and the doings on five days immediately before lay within his personal knowledge. The whole movement was affiliated to that begun by John the Baptist, who had sent two of his disciples to Jesus; one of these was Andrew, who had lived some time in Mark's home, together with his brother Cephas, whom he had speedily introduced to Jesus. These two, with their cousins the sons of Zebedee, had been the closest friends of Jesus, and their reminiscences of the earlier days before Mark met him must have been most familiar. Another important point; on the very day of the resurrection, Jesus had impressed on Cleopas how he had been spoken of in the scriptures, so that from the first this linking with the prophets had been cardinal. As for what had happened since, Mark knew all the facts, which he had reported to the Mother-Church. Material therefore, abundant and accurate, was at his disposal; what should be done with it?

The plan he evolved, very likely after much searching of heart, seems to have been to write three chapters. The man Jesus in his public life, "going about and doing good" to Jews and to Gentiles; his death and resurrection; what he continued to do and to teach after he was received up, through the agency of the society which he founded.

Language and length had to be decided. His native Aramaic would be all right for Syria and eastward to the masses of Jews on the Euphrates; but his aim was distinctly at Romans; as a Marcus he had an imperial vision. Latin was not popular. On the cross Pilate had placed a tablet in Aramaic and Latin and Greek. Greek was in use from Antioch to Alexandria and Lyons at least; every cultivated Roman knew it, and even came for study at centres of Hellenic learning. Greek was clearly best. Then as to length. Philo and other Jewish authors had adopted the conventions of Alexandria, where stationers stocked blank rolls able to contain about 2,600 narrow lines, about 94,000 letters. To compress to such a size was clearly advisable. Anybody who has "commenced author" can

envisage the tremendous task that lay before the novice. To get matters in proportion, to sacrifice telling anecdotes for sheer lack of space, to reject everything which did not seem essential to his leading conceptions, to refine these as he went along, and rewrite again and again.

Now while Mark was bringing back to the anvil his rough work, other men of Jerusalem were imperilling the cause he had at heart. They went down to Antioch, and insisted that no one could be saved unless he was circumcised after the custom of Moses. After much disturbance, that Church sent a deputation, headed by Barnabas and Saul, to headquarters; Cephas got a hearing for the two emissaries, James proposed a solution which was accepted, and an official letter written to disown the trouble-makers was despatched by the hands of two leaders in Jerusalem. Evidently Mark joined the party, and heard announced in speech and in writing the endorsement of the liberal policy, acknowledging the Gentiles of Antioch and Syria and Cilicia as brethren, without any observance of the Jewish Law.

The joy of this climax was soon overclouded for him when Saul refused his company on a second tour, blaming him for his return home on the former. His uncle, torn between the two, chose Mark, and went a second time to the scene of their first triumph. When Cyprus had been visited again, it would appear that Mark discerned it high time to fulfil his own undertaking, to revise his book, bringing it to a climax with the Council at Jerusalem, which so expressly announced that the good news was for all men, that all followers of the Teacher were brethren. He devised a title which was a masterpiece, though most badly obscured for us by a punctuation which produces a manifest error. Read it as Irenaeus twice quotes it, commenting on it:—

THE BEGINNING OF THE GOOD NEWS ABOUT JESUS,
CHRIST, SON OF GOD,
EVEN AS IT WAS WRITTEN IN ISAIAH THE PROPHET.

It calls attention to three things about Jesus: He was the Messiah, though on a pattern unexpected by the multitude; He was, as hailed by a Roman centurion, a Son of God; both these characteristics had been foretold centuries ago.

The case is stated. One thing may be appended, What happened to two-fifths of Mark's book. Then the proof of the case may be outlined.

The existing part of the Gospel is only about 1,600 lines. Obviously it breaks off in the middle of a sentence; and because the other three Gospels end near the Ascension, it has been assumed that this also did, and that only the end leaf is gone. The present theory

is that Mark brought his story to date; as Luke did afterwards, beginning earlier and ending later. Now Luke avowedly had inherited various narratives from eye-witnesses, and it is agreed on all hands that one of these was Mark. From Luke's second volume, *Acts*, subtract (1) what is manifestly due to Saul, the opponent of Stephen, and member of the Sanhedrin; (2) what is due to Philip, Luke's host at Caesarea; (3) the story told at Caesarea as to Peter's visit, leaving the story that Peter told at Jerusalem rather earlier; (4) the story of Herod's death at Caesarea; (5) the tour in Galatia, when Luke first came in contact with the movement; (6) everything that fell within Luke's own knowledge, from *Acts* 16 onwards. The remainder is a connected story of incidents within the personal knowledge of Mark, down to the Council of Jerusalem. It has been independently observed, by people who never broached the present theory, that this remainder shows many Aramaisms, as if Luke were depending on a document. The present conclusion is that just as Luke edited three-fifths of Mark's work into his first volume, so he edited two-fifths into his second. It is impossible to un-edit and recover the original words of Mark; but the incidents he chose are there, and they justify the account given of the original.

The evidence in *Mark* leads along five lines: The Interest of Jesus in foreigners; Many incidents known to Peter, irrelevant to Mark's purpose as here depicted, are omitted by him; Signs that the writing was early; Comments on events crucial on the present theory; Analysis of the discourse on the Mount of Olives.

(*i*) *Interest in Foreigners.*

Few details are given of any work done by Jesus in his own land, away from the frontier. As far as *Mark* shows, he was always within an hour of Gentile territory. On a frontier, revenue officers are rather prominent, and *Mark* notes that Jesus supped with many of them. There are details of visits to Bethsaida, which had been rebuilt by its ruler, Philip, as Julias. There was a visit to Gerasa, and when he was not welcome, the demoniac was told to go and tell about Jesus; this man, too, had hailed Jesus as "Son of God", a title that was important to Mark. At an early stage, people came from Idumea, Tyre, Sidon. One visit only is placed inland, to Nazareth; the flat rejection there illustrates the reluctance of Jews generally some fifteen years later to recognize their Messiah in Jesus, in contrast to the welcome by Samaritans, an Ethiopian, soldiers at Caesarea, Greeks at Antioch, a proconsul at Paphos. Jesus, marvelling at their unbelief, soon crossed the border into Tyrian territory; and even entered a Gentile house, a step which Peter afterwards hesitated to take at Caesarea. This was the beginning of a long tour among foreigners, to Bethsaida again, to Gerasa again, and after a sail across to Dalmanutha, yet a third time. Then far north

to Caesarea-Philippi. These foreign expeditions and their success are much in contrast with the suspicion of the Jews, especially those from Jerusalem; it is seldom noticed that in the account of the country ministry, more than a quarter of the space is given to work among foreigners. The appointment of the Twelve is connected with the presence of people from Idumea, Tyre and Sidon; while the turning-point—the Transfiguration—was in heathen territory.

(*ii*) *Striking Omissions.*

We know from other evangelists of many interesting matters, most of which involved Peter closely, which Mark does not record: the inference is either that these anecdotes do not bear on his purposes, or that these had been sufficiently illustrated. It is astonishing that there is scarcely any of the teaching of Jesus, such as adorns the pages of the other evangelists. Nothing about what was said in any synagogue, even at Capernaum, the home of Peter. No Sermon on the Mount. None of Peter's own preaching when sent forth, nor a single anecdote as to his experiences on this apprenticeship. No account of the mighty works at Chorazin. Two Home missions mentioned, without a shred of detail; Mark was interested in Foreign missions. Nothing of Peter's adventure on the lake, of the striking sequel to his avowal that Jesus was the Messiah, of his half-shekel, of his inquiry how often he should forgive. There are other trifles, but these are enough to show that Mark left out a great deal which he must have heard repeatedly. The evidence of selection is abundant; and the reason suggested is that nearly all these omissions accord with the theory that Mark had his eye on Romans. Romans did not care much about preaching; they wanted facts, as Peter had seen He went about, "doing good".

(*iii*) *Early Date.*

The Antioch period is matched both in phrases, and in incidents chosen. The "Sea" of Galilee is just a mile longer than Windermere; New England and New York have many lakes larger. If Peter had been afloat on the Mediterranean, he would hardly call his lake a "sea". Again, that lake was like four Swiss lakes to-day, with its shores in the time of Christ under different rulers; Mark reported accurately, though after the death of Herod Agrippa I at Caesarea in 44 A.D. the Romans ruled directly over all, and Capernaum was no longer a frontier-town. With the death of that king the "Herodians" would soon lose all political importance; it is only Mark who mentions them. That king had executed James the son of Zebedee, and at the Council of Jerusalem the leader was another James; when therefore Mark had to refer to the dead man, it was desirable to identify him by his father or his brother, so as to prevent confusion. The later James wrote a letter which advises anointing

the sick in hope of their recovery; that very prescription is in the commission to the twelve, and is never quoted again. This James inspired an official letter to Antioch, stating that the Jewish system was not binding on brethren of the Gentiles; for this Mark gives an excellent precedent in showing how Jesus forgave sins freely, without any temple sacrifice, to a paralytic at Capernaum, and expressly justified the deed.

Four things are closely associated with Mark and his home. The list of the twelve is in the unusual order which splits a pair of brothers, Simon, James, John, Andrew; that same order is preserved by Luke when mentioning the residents in the upper room after the Ascension. The death of Ananias for lying "to the Holy Spirit" illustrates the warning of Jesus about blaspheming the Holy Spirit. The discountenancing of fasting by Jesus has a plain bearing on that fasting which Mark had seen at Antioch just before his uncle had been sent forth. Our Lord's eating with publicans and sinners was a good precedent for Cephas eating with Gentiles at Antioch, which led on to the Council at Jerusalem.

Take also the two stories about John the Baptist. There was an excellent reason for leading off with the first, when, as Isaiah had foretold, he made ready the Way of the Lord. Only Marcion had the courage to refuse following that lead, and to start with the ministry at Capernaum; he expressly rejected the connection with the Old Covenant, on which Mark laid emphasis. But there is a second story, of John's imprisonment and death, appended to Herod's remark about Jesus, "John, whom I beheaded, he is risen". The account may rest on such good authority as Manaen, Herod's foster-brother, at Antioch. The question is, Why is it given at such length, when a short sentence might have summarized? A reasonable answer is that John the Baptist was still remembered twelve years after his death, even as he was by Apollos eight years later still. But outside the New Testament the only other mention of him is by Josephus, whose account is hard to reconcile with Mark's, as if the incident, and even the man, were half forgotten.

(*iv*) *Comments by Mark.*

More than a dozen comments were made by Mark. One is widely recognized; that the utterance of Jesus as to food not making unclean did in effect make all meats clean—the very point at Antioch. Just before the anecdote is a long parenthesis, on the repeated washings by Jews, hardly credible at first to Romans, so that Juvenal also commented on them. A third is an inference from the words of our Lord, "The sabbath is made for man, not man for the sabbath"; Mark infers, "So, then, the Son of Man is lord even of the sabbath". This had two bearings; there had been no reason for the women to wait till "the sabbath was past" before they went to anoint the body

of Jesus; and it justified the neglect of the sabbath, which commemorated nothing now relevant and had been declared by prophets to be a sign for distinguishing Jews from others, a distinction now acknowledged even at Jerusalem to be unimportant. Another possible comment is after the sayings as to patching clothes and old wineskins; these close with a note (bracketed by Westcott and Hort), "But new wine into fresh skins", which bears directly on Gentile liberty. After the parable of the Sower, there is a detailed interpretation. Against this being from Jesus Himself, there are these points: Grammar and language are rather muddled, turning an illustration into a long allegory, distracting from the point common to the three parables of sowing, that despite apparent failure and delay success is certain. If the parable be treated as an allegory with every feature significant, then it would be fair to blame the sower for wasting seed on the path, for throwing it among thorns, for not having rooted out the thorns long ago, for not having carted good soil on to the thin places. Nobody thinks that these were lessons intended by Jesus, and it is equally unlikely that He intended the elaborate exposition here given; it seems a comment by Mark after his experience that the Jews had rejected, and that Gentiles were welcoming abundantly. Again, on the whole subject of parables, Mark gives in one breath two explanations which are inconsistent; that they were meant to conceal the truth from outsiders, and yet that they were constantly used. He seems never to have made up his mind whether they were riddles or obvious illustrations. Yet another comment in this connection is noteworthy; a quotation from his favourite *Isaiah* is used so as to say plainly that Jesus used parables in order to harden men's hearts and prevent their repentance! This incredible reason has puzzled every thinker; if we treat it as a comment by Mark and cut it out, with his other comments in this context, then the fourth chapter becomes far more intelligible. The evangelist seems to have interpolated them after seeing that in fact Israel had been hardened, exactly as in the days of Isaiah, but that there was compensation in the coming of the Gentiles. In his account of the synagogue healing he does expressly advert to the hardening of heart.

That incident shows also how fond he was of attributing motives. Jesus would not allow demons to speak "because they knew him"; He warned against blasphemy "because they said, He has an unclean spirit"; scribes were "reasoning in their hearts", he questioned them "perceiving in his spirit" they watched him "that they might accuse him"; Pharisees put a question "that they might accuse him". Whether Mark was right or wrong in these cases, he obviously did guess at their inner motives; and his interpretation may well reflect the experience he had gained after a few years of the hostility of these classes, which made it nearly useless to keep on trying to win

them. Jesus had gone to Jews "first", as Peter had said; then had turned to Gentiles at Tyre. Mark was doing the same; Paul was presently to crystallize the change into a proverb.

The "barren figtree" seems to contain two comments. If we remove Peter's suggestion that Jesus went to it "if haply he might find anything thereon", and Mark's own rejoinder that it was not the season of figs, then the story is relieved of several difficulties, and we can attend without delay to the teaching that Jesus founded on the incident; in this case, Luke does show fuller insight. Such specimens of comment do not always enhance our respect for the insight of Mark, but they do show that he was not a mere dictaphone, and that he had tried to understand, then to apply.

(v) The talk on the Mount of Olives.

In passover week Mark had the opportunity of hearing Jesus often. But he expressly says that on the Mount of Olives Peter and James and John and Andrew asked Jesus privately, and elicited what is far the longest discourse in the book. It is a fair question why Mark chose to record it. The answer is that it deals with the return of Jesus in glory, after preaching, and it urges the need of constant watchfulness for this. Thus it is in line with two of Mark's major topics, that Jesus was divine, that the whole world was to hear about Him. The discourse is misread by those who start with the question put by the disciples, "When will the temple be destroyed?", and forget that Jesus did not answer that question, but turned attention to more important matters. It is true that *Matthew* and *Luke* both blur His refusal, and do add allusions to the fall of Jerusalem; it is Mark's account that deserves study now.

The solitary reference to the temple in the reply is enigmatic, "When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not". At this point Mark interpolates a direction to study the enigma and solve it ("Let him that readeth, understand"). *Daniel* mentions the sanctuary being polluted, the daily sacrifices stopped, the abomination that maketh desolate placed there. This plainly refers to the doings of Antiochus Epiphanes as recorded in *I Macc.* Now whereas the Greek ruler had built "an abomination of desolation upon the altar", the Roman emperor Caius Caligula, annoyed by the coolness of the Jews, whose spokesman was Philo, contemplated a very similar thing; he ordered that his statue be erected in the temple. Josephus gives a long account of the incident, with the passive resistance of myriads of Jews. Clearly Mark recognized this order as fulfilling the anticipation of Jesus, and therefore inserted this pointer. The event dates Mark's work; and it was in the last year of Caius, 40-41 A.D., between Mark's two visits to Antioch.

Mark took very little interest in that apocalyptic line of thought. In most ages, there have been people calculating the date of Christ's

return, and mapping out the course of events. Only Mark had the insight to see the importance of the warning of Jesus, "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father". The obsession with the future course of events has been encouraged, and evinced, by both Matthew and Luke removing that notice, "No thoroughfare". Mark saw the importance of the duty involved in "The gospel must first be preached unto all the nations", a sentence dropped by both his editors.

In other respects, we are not aware that the anticipations of Jesus were fulfilled in the days of Claudius, or soon after. We know nothing of any brother betraying his brother; of anybody being brought before rulers for Christ's sake, even though James and Peter had been condemned for that reason by Herod the king; of anybody coming in the name of Jesus pretending to be Himself returned. And more than that; when the temple was destroyed a generation later, Josephus, an eye-witness, is at pains to distinguish between the battering down of the outer walls, and the burning of the temple, leaving its walls standing—though Jesus had said that not one stone should be left on another. Such differences show well the honesty of Mark's report, and the honesty of copyists who did not afterwards doctor it to match the facts.

On these five lines of evidence it may be shown that Mark's book is no artless heap of reminiscences, but a careful composition, meant to appeal at a given date to a certain class, civil and military Romans, to explain a movement of nearly twenty years' growth, which was foreseen centuries before, and had now rooted itself as no rural aberration, but as destined to worldwide expansion.

A generation later, Mark's acquaintance Luke made a similar appeal, dedicating his two volumes, based on Mark's work, to a noble Greek. The original work was also edited for the Jewish Church in Palestine, whether it read Greek or Aramaic. Even fifty years after Mark, a perfectly independent book came forth to interpret Jesus to Asians, which they gratefully acknowledged. All three authors followed Mark in approaching definite classes, in ways adapted to their definite times.

Within another half-century, two attempts were made to combine all sources as to the life of Jesus; an aim merely biographical, differing from that of the original authors. Tatian of Assyria adopted the old mechanical method of the Jews, sliced up the four stories, pieced them ingeniously into one; this method has been followed by others, by Mimpriss and Waddy last century. A mere publisher took the two rolls bearing the name of apostles, Matthew and John, the first roll of Luke without its fellow, and so much of Mark as ran parallel;

these four he copied and bound into an Omnibus Volume. This custom became standard, though the order varied slightly.

Three other men of that century wrote a few lines which may be noted about this part of Mark's book. Papias of Asia gleaned from the Elder John a few remarks; but unfortunately they do not bear on the two questions here discussed, the *When* and the *Why* of the book. Irenaeus of Lyons, who equally inherited the Asian tradition, said that Mark wrote after Peter laid the foundation of the Church at Rome, and departed. Mark's book went where he never trod; and it may explain why Alexandria, home of books, claimed him as its father in God. In that capital Clement afterwards wrote what Eusebius quotes twice, though it is strangely neglected—that Peter was at Rome in the days of Claudius (41-54), that the Romans induced Mark to write, Peter neither hindering nor encouraging.

Return then from these fragments of a later century to the letters of Peter and Paul. Long after the days of Claudius, Peter sent greetings all over Asia Minor, commending Mark as his son; that letter went from Rome. Paul also had come to recognize the value of work he had not thought of; he sent to Colosse advice to listen to Mark, who was then with him at Rome. (This was a fine apology for his earlier misunderstanding, when he had declined Mark's company in that very region.) It may be a recognition that to preach only about Christ as "crucified" was too narrow, and that people blown about with winds of doctrine concerning thrones, dominions, principalities and powers, needed ballasting with solid facts about Jesus in the flesh, Who had disregarded traditions of men about sabbath days, and ordinances about not handling, touching, tasting. Again, when Paul was fearing condemnation and death, he wrote for Mark to come and be helpful. For ministering? How? If Mark had not broken ground with a book, would anyone have thought of collecting letters of Paul, and of publishing that invaluable memorial? Barnabas once rescued Saul from obscurity; did Mark prompt Luke to gather and to introduce Paul to all future generations? In any case, Mark's gospel, designed for Latins at three capitals, was henceforth adopted by the Church at Rome itself.

Herodotus, father of history, both amassed facts with patience, and with care wove them together to illustrate one great theme. Polybius explained to Greeks the reason why the primacy of the world had passed to Rome; "a scrupulous fear of the gods is the very thing which keeps the Roman Commonwealth together". Mark humbly entered that succession; he offered to Rome a knowledge of the true God, and thus became the father of Christian literature.

GEORGE HADFIELD, JOSEPH PARKER, AND OTHER CORRESPONDENTS.

By Francis Wrigley, B.A.

There is one name strangely absent from Dr. Peel's most informing book, *A Hundred Eminent Congregationalists*. It is the name of George Hadfield, of Manchester, who died in 1879 at the age of 91.

Mr. Samuel Whittaker, who knows everything there is to be known about Manchester Congregationalism, has kindly furnished me with a summary of his career. Born in Sheffield, he came to Manchester in 1810 and practised as a solicitor in Fountain Street. He helped to found the Congregational Church in Rusholme Road, and was a loyal member for more than 50 years. But his interests and his sympathies extended far beyond the frontiers of his solicitor's office or his home-church. In the early days of the Lancashire Congregational Union he was elected one of the Hon. Secretaries at the age of 24. He was one of the promoters of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in 1831-2. He laid the foundation stone, I believe, of Lancashire College in Whalley Range, and was more than anyone else responsible for bringing the College from Blackburn to Manchester; he gave 2,000 guineas to the Building Fund. Very shortly the College will be celebrating its Centenary and no name will be more duly honoured than that of George Hadfield. It would take too long to enumerate his splendid gifts to great causes. The *D.N.B.* says:

> George Hadfield.
>
> In 1864 he offered 1,000*l.* a year for five years on condition that during that time fifty independent chapels should be built. He afterwards repeated the offer with the same success.

Perhaps his greatest work financially was the restoration to its original purpose of the "Lady Hewley Fund". This involved great research and long litigation, and even a large fortune, and those who benefit by this fund to-day should be glad to honour their benefactor.

George Hadfield was true to the Congregational tradition in taking a keen interest in politics. He was among the founders of the Anti-Corn-Law League and he subscribed largely to build the Free Trade Hall in Manchester. For 22 years he was Liberal Member of Parliament for his native town of Sheffield and proved a valiant defender of the cause of civil and religious liberty. Twice was he offered a baronetcy, but this honour he declined. Sufficient has been said to justify the inclusion of his name in any list of "Eminent Congregationalists": Manchester is proud to reckon him among her most distinguished citizens.

Some letters have recently come into my possession which were written to Hadfield, and evidently treasured by him. They cover a period of many years and some of them have more than a passing interest. I have permission to use them. I find from these letters that Samuel Morley was among those who induced Hadfield to stand for Parliament and letters from Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Stanley, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and others indicated the esteem and confidence he inspired.

John Angell James was one of Hadfield's intimate friends and was always a welcome guest at his home in Victoria Park, Manchester. On his election to Parliament, James wrote him a letter of congratulation:

> I am *sure* that you will be an honest, independent, and faithful senator, uncorrupted and incorruptible . . . . I will give you a motto which has been of service to *me*: "I will go in the strength of the Lord God".

There is a letter, too, from Thomas Binney congratulating him on carrying a bill through Parliament:

> It is a grand result and must have its effect on the minds of other members for generations to come, encouraging them to persevere in spite of all opposition in the belief that the true and the right will win at last . . . . You—at least—have not been in Parliament in vain.

When in London, Hadfield attended Westminster Chapel, and rejoiced in the ministry of Samuel Martin. On his retiring from Parliament in 1874, Martin wrote him an affectionate farewell:

> We shall miss you from the pew in the Chapel and often, very often, we shall think of you . . . . May the years that remain to you be full of God's loving-kindness and tender mercy.

Dr. John Campbell, too, appears on the scene ("one of the most striking men Congregationalism has ever produced" Dr. Peel has called him). He was a man of fiery temper, but in his letters to Hadfield there are traces of a lighter mood.

> So you are going to drink the waters of wisdom in the midst of the British Association. How I envy you rich men! You have much to be accountable for. But with all my envy, I congratulate you!

In reference to some Irish question before Parliament, he writes:

> I really have as much confidence in Irish logic as in the rotten potato. Nothing is more preposterous than to oppose Maynooth and at the same time gulp the *Regium Donum*.

But some of the most interesting letters in this bundle of correspondence, as far as Congregationalism is concerned, are from Dr. Joseph Parker. Parker evidently came to know Hadfield during his brief ministry in Manchester. The first of these letters is dated Oct.

19, 1865, and is written from "Old Trafford". The tone of the letter indicates that 70 years ago Nonconformity made a popular appeal.

> I finished my Free Trade Hall lectures on Nonconformity last night. I intend visiting many of the rural districts and expounding our principles where they are little known . . . . I propose to distribute tens of thousands of publications gratuitously at Church Congresses and on all proper occasions. To carry out this idea vigorously, I shall require *one thousand pounds*. I shall feel deeply encouraged and gratified if *you* will contribute £5 to the undertaking. I do not ask any man to give more. All Nonconformists owe *you* a debt which never can be paid . . . .

This letter brought "a handsome and prompt response".

Eight years pass. Meanwhile Parker has gone to London and conceived the idea of a "City Temple". Not unnaturally he asked Hadfield's help:

> Dear Mr. Hadfield,
>
> Shall I have the honour of your veteran name on my list? You have never said NO to me, so I shall hope still. *Fifty pounds* from you would make me and my people very happy. In building for the *City* of London, we feel that we are building for the *world*. Let us have your hearty God-speed.
>
> I am most respectf'y yrs.,
>
> Joseph Parker.

This letter, with its Parkeresque conclusion, brought not only a welcome response—the promise of £50 payable in March—but inquiries showing that Hadfield's legal and practical mind had been at work on the scheme. On Jan. 28th Parker replied:

> Dear Mr. Hadfield,
>
> Your letter quite warms my heart. My wife and I unite in thanking you for it most earnestly and affectionately.
>
> Happily all your important inquiries can be answered most satisfactorily.
>
> 1. The site is bought of the Corporation and is freehold.
> 2. We are working wholly under the direction and sanction of the Charity Comrs., so you may rely upon every legal point being satisfied.
> 3. The plans have been prepared by Messrs. Lockwood & Mawson (who built every inch of Saltaire for Sir Titus Salt), and the Contractors are Messrs. Myers & Sons, who built Springhill College.
> 4. Large provision is made for Day and Sunday Schools.
> 5. Rooms for the occasional residence of the Minister have been arranged for.
> 6. Rely upon it that the *poor* will not be forgotten in connexion with the new building.

7. The works are proceeding vigorously.

My Manchester friends are very kind. Mr. Sidebottom gives £100; Mr. Joseph Spencer gives £100; &c., &c. I am asking Mr. Rylands to give 300 guineas to found a *Library* which shall be the property of the Pastors through all time.

The style of architecture is ITALIAN, and everything will be simple and good.

I thank God for such a letter as yours. When our friends meet me on Thursday night they will be made glad by such cheering words.

I note your words—"if life be spared": at your age such words have special significance; we are in the hands of God, and must work and wait in faith.

Look at us very carefully. You have hit the strong point of the case in pointing out the priceless importance of *retaining hold of the City*. That was the consideration which determined us.

Have you any influence with Mr. John Crossley, Mr. Hugh Mason, Sir Elk: Armitage, or Mr. Sam Watts?

Excuse great haste, in order to catch the morning post, and believe me,

Most respect'y and gratef'y yrs.,
Joseph Parker.

March came, and Parker sent a reminder, telling the layman that the work of building had begun and "the builders are beginning to talk about *money* and we are now getting in all we can to meet the first payment". He said at what a cost they were hiring the Great Hall of Cannon Street Hotel for the morning service and Exeter Hall for the evening service. "It is weary work, this waiting. O how I long for a place of my own!"

The cheque, of course, was sent, and glowingly acknowledged. Within a few months the City Temple was built, and Parker's great dream came true: the voice that spoke from that pulpit did really speak to the world. It was heard as far as the "Rocky Mountains".

CROMWELL AND LENIN: A COMPARISON AND A CONTRAST

By D. R. Davies.

Fifteen years after his death, it is perhaps possible to write with some degree of dispassion about Lenin. The violent revulsions and hatreds roused by the Bolshevik Revolution, and by Lenin, especially, as its chief architect, have burnt low, so that it is now possible to estimate him as a historic figure. That he is such a figure, and, moreover, one of gigantic proportions, nobody capable of judging will deny. For good or evil, Lenin was a great man.

The tempestuous reactions to Lenin, however, are still a memory to all who remember the Bolshevik Revolution. But the passions roused by Cromwell are not even that. They are merely history. It is difficult for us of the twentieth century to realize that to many of his contemporaries Cromwell was Satan incarnate. It is always something of a shock to realize that the established, conventional, and orthodox was, once upon a time, a thing of violent controversy, a divider of nations and families. It is nearly impossible for us to believe to-day that Beethoven was criticized for not being tuneful! So we find it difficult, especially if we are Congregationalists, to enter into the minds of our 17th century forbears who saw in Cromwell nothing but evil. All that has passed into history.

While, of course, it is an advantage when great figures pass into history, the process also has its disadvantages. When a man becomes history, his humanity becomes dimmed and obscured. That is exactly what has happened to Cromwell and Lenin. In the minds of men to-day, they no longer wear our common habiliments. They have become a different clay. And so we miss something essential. We can always take it absolutely for granted that all the great figures that have dominated their time were human, all too human. And we can be grateful to the modern school of biographers for helping us to realize that fact. The debunking involved may be painful, but is certainly salutary. Both Cromwell and Lenin were men, too: Cromwell with his warts and Lenin with his bald head.

Though separated by centuries of time, both Cromwell and Lenin had much in common. But they also differed greatly. A consideration of their characteristics and work may contribute something to an understanding of a Christian philosophy of history.

I.

Let me begin with their personal similarities.

(1) Both had the rare gift—and to an extreme degree—of being

able to seize the essentials of a situation. The bigger and the more vital and decisive the situation, the more finely their gift operated. Let me give one example[1]:

In the fateful struggle between King and Parliament, it was Cromwell, almost alone, who realized the vital significance of the cavalry. Once the argument had entered the arena of arms, the essential thing was to conquer the Royal forces. At first, things went badly for the Parliamentary armies. Rupert, with his dashing horsemen, was too much for them. Cromwell learnt quickly from the defeats that Parliament's only chance of victory in the field was the creation of a cavalry superior to Rupert's. It is one of Cromwell's many claims to greatness that he, a non-military man, created an army, with the new technical equipment, cavalry, which ultimately assured victory to the revolutionary forces. The fundamental, essential necessity of the situation Cromwell saw and fulfilled.

In the Russian situation of 1917 Lenin saw that nothing could be done without the peasantry. He was almost alone in his realization of that fact. In his decree which gave the land to the peasants he violated socialist theory and offended many of his own party. He gave the peasants the land in order to win and keep their support for the revolution. In a population of 150,000,000, 138,000,000 of whom were peasants, the only possible chance for the revolution to win through was its support by the peasants:

> . . . in giving the land immediately to the peasants . . . the Bolsheviks will form a Government which nobody will overthrow (*Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?*, 3).

Had the peasants gone against the Bolsheviks, they would not have lasted six months. Lenin grasped that essential with all his being.

(2) Both men had immense strength of will and great executive ability. They were those men, so rare in history, whose will to act was not impaired by their gift of speech. Great orators, as a rule, lack executive power. They tend to think that speech is a substitute for deeds. Briand was an example of this[2]. There was none of this defect in either Cromwell or Lenin. Both had immense "drive". Cromwell trained an army and created a Government. Lenin created a cast-iron party which withstood the greatest pressure. It maintained its unity even in face of the profound differences about the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. Cromwell made England strong. Lenin saved the Revolution against the whole capitalist world.

(3) A third quality shared by both men was utter ruthlessness. Cromwell made no bones about things. Neither did Lenin. We are all familiar with Cromwell's celebrated saying about King Charles, that if he saw him in battle he would "as lief draw his pistol" on him

[1] Much as I should like abundant examples, both here and throughout the article, space forbids more than the bare minimum.

[2] *Vide* Mr. Lloyd George's *Memoirs of the Peace-Treaty*, I.

as on any other man. His cruelty in Drogheda and Wexford is an authenticated historical fact. His treatment of disaffected elements among his own Ironsides was utterly ruthless, too. Once Cromwell had made his decision, he allowed no obstacle to stand in the way.

Lenin demonstrated the same attitude towards both friends and enemies. When on the eve of the Insurrection in October Zinoviev and Kamenev opposed a party decision in the Press, Lenin described them as blacklegs, and urged that they be drummed out of the party. He was merciless in his treatment of enemies. John Reed[3] tells of a Commissar who reported to Lenin the refusal of the cashier of the State Bank to hand over the keys of the safe. What was he to do? Lenin's advice was brief: "Go to the Bank with a company of the Red Guards, and if the cashier refuses again, shoot him". He organized the Cheka, the system of secret police, for swift liquidation of all who opposed the Revolution.

It is an interesting, though grim, question whether, in periods of social upheaval, ruthlessness is not more merciful in its effects than sentiment and pity. If the Spanish Popular Front Government in February, 1936, when it came to power, had shot a few Francos and Molas and de Llanos, might not the tragedy of the Civil War have been avoided? Whatever answer we give to that question, it is certain that the makers of history in every era, whether religious or not, have been utterly ruthless in the pursuit of their goal. Such were Cromwell and Lenin.

(4) Yet they both exhibited, in marked degree, the opposite quality of sympathy and humanity. However contradictory this may appear to be, we must accept it as a fact. There is nothing surprising in it to any realist student of human nature. The character of men—even of the greatest—is not all of a piece. Men—all men—are both good and evil. And both Cromwell and Lenin were merciless and merciful at the same time. Many of Cromwell's letters breathe tenderness. There are literally scores of examples in Lenin's correspondence of his anxiety for party comrades. Lenin, there can be no doubt, had a great human heart. Maxim Gorki[4] tells a little-known story about him. One night, during the height of the Civil War, Gorki took Lenin to hear a young Russian pianist perform on the piano. Amongst other things, he played Beethoven's "Appassionata" Sonata. Lenin was greatly affected; he deplored the fact that he lived at a time when he had to be cruel; as long as the Civil War lasted, he said, he would listen no more to such music.

(5) Both men were characterized by a profound, constant, and undeviating devotion to a cause—Cromwell to that of Parliamentary freedom and Lenin to that of working-class emancipation.

[3] *Ten Days that Shook the World.*
[4] *Days with Lenin.*

Of the two, Lenin appears to be the more striking in his dedication to his ideal. It is literally true to say that he absolutely lived and breathed for the Revolution. During his years of exile in France, Switzerland, Austria, and England, he lived in appalling poverty. Both he and his wife, whilst they were in London, never had more than thirty shillings a week. In all the long annals of human devotion, there is no finer record than that of Lenin. He once wrote[5]:

> We must train people who shall devote to the Revolution, not only their spare evenings, but their whole lives.

Through the years of failure and defeat, he never deviated or slackened his energy. He had a fanatical faith that the Revolution was bound to come.

To a less striking degree, the same thing is true of Cromwell. His passion for freedom was so great that he had contemplated leaving England for the New World. Fortunately for Europe, he stayed. Night and day, without cease, he laboured for the cause in which he so deeply believed.

These fine qualities—the power to grasp essentials, great strength of will and executive ability, ruthlessness, sympathy, and utter devotion—while they by no means exhaust the comparison, certainly show how much alike the two men were. They were alike even in their puritanism, their personal abstemiousness and asceticism. Revolutionary upheavals seem to call for certain qualities of strength and character in every age. We see that fact demonstrated in the persons both of Cromwell and Lenin who, when the hour struck, rode the whirlwind and directed the storm.

Their similarities were striking. Let me point out a profound and fundamental difference between them, from which sprang all their other divergences of character.

I think it can be best expressed by the word "humility". Cromwell, for all his coarseness, was fundamentally a humble man. In Lenin, there is not a trace of humility. He was utterly, dogmatically certain that he was always right. Cromwell, let me repeat, was humble; Lenin was arrogant. Nothing indicates the world of difference between the two men so much as Cromwell's last prayer:

> Lord, though I am a miserable and wretched creature, I am in covenant with Thee for Thy people. Thou hast made me, though very unworthy, a mean instrument to do them some good and Thee service . . . Lord, however Thou do dispose of me, continue to go on to do good for them. Give them consistency of judgment, one heart and mutual love; and go on to deliver them, and with the work of reformation; and make the name of Christ glorious in the world. Teach them who look too much upon Thy instruments, to depend more upon Thyself . . . And

[5] *Collected Works*, IV, 57.

pardon the folly of this short prayer: Even for Jesus Christ's sake. And give us a good night if it be Thy pleasure. Amen.

Profound consequences follow from this difference.

First, the fear of power. Cromwell had great power, and he used it well and ill, but he was profoundly conscious of its danger and evil. It was a Christian historian, Lord Acton, who said that "all power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely". Lenin gloried in power, and was unaware of its dangers. We find the same mentality in Hitler, to whom power is a god.

Second, the spirit of toleration. For all his ruthlessness, Cromwell was tolerant and consequently could be generous and just to an enemy. Lenin was completely devoid of toleration and consequently was incapable of generosity. He heaps coarse abuse upon his foes and dismisses those who differ from him as scoundrels.

Third, the deploring of violence and bloodshed. Though Cromwell shed much blood, he was burdened and troubled by the "cruel necessity". Lenin had no qualms about it. He definitely advocated and gloried in the use of Terrorism, as Marx did before him. Lenin showed little trace of any appreciation of the humanity of those whom he regarded as his enemies. A terrible nemesis has already followed the use of the Terror in Russia, where the Terrorists have turned upon one another.

II.

We come now to what is possibly of profounder significance, the historic achievements of the two men. Both were revolutionaries. Both were destroyers of the old and builders of a new order. But there was a vast difference between them in the revolutions they effected.

Some years ago the *Daily Herald* declared that Cromwell could not be described as a "pioneer of the Labour Movement" and instanced in support the harsh treatment meted out to the Levellers. However, one does not look to the *Daily Herald* for historical insight. But even the *Daily Herald* should have known better. Of course, Cromwell was the pioneer of a precisely opposite movement —the rise of a new middle class. What to-day we call the working class was then only in its beginnings. Cromwell destroyed feudalism in England and cleared the way for the rise of the new capitalist system. The agitation of his own Left Wing—that of the Levellers and Diggers—was historically premature. Had they had power, they would have done nothing. Communism was no more possible in the England of the 17th century than was the aeroplane in the Athens of the 4th century B.C. Hidden in the issue of King *versus* Parliament was the challenge of a new class—the middle classes of the towns and cities—for political power. The King, together with the Anglican Church, stood for a system that had lost all progressive

content and had become completely reactionary. The privileges of the landed, feudal aristocracy were an obstacle to the development of industry and commerce. Cromwell was the mouthpiece and leader of the new class, and by his defeat of the Royalists he laid the foundations of capitalism and of the political power of the middle classes. Just over a hundred years later, the French Revolution completed for Europe the task begun by Cromwell in England. It was in England that the new capitalist civilization took its rise.

Lenin was the destroyer in Russia of the system Cromwell pioneered in England. In the intervening years between Cromwell and Lenin capitalism had developed and declined. In the course of its growth it had created the new modern working-class, which was completely property-less. It had only its labour-power to sell. It was of this class that Lenin was the leader. Cromwell flung the challenge of the middle classes for political power to the feudal aristocracy. Lenin flung the challenge of the working class for power to the middle classes. Hence Lenin destroyed the work of Cromwell, and in doing so, completed and fulfilled it.

Capitalism, which had its rise in England, was destined to spread all over the world. It is probably true to say that, though nothing is inevitable in history till it has happened, Socialism, which has first emerged in Russia, is also destined to spread all over the world. Europe and the world will probably have to undergo the tragedy of further revolution, civil war, and world war before the new system triumphs. In the providence of God new Lenins and Cromwells will arise to destroy and to build anew.

History is dynamic. It does not stand still. Therefore, we can be quite sure that both Cromwell and Lenin were doing the work of God. That, of course, does not mean that everything they did was God's will. We know that it was not. But the development of mankind from a mass, tribalized consciousness to the achievement of personality and a world-community of persons is the divine will. Both Cromwell and Lenin were most certainly instrumental in that profound, historic process. That one of the actors had no consciousness of Providence in history makes no difference to its reality.

III.

Conclusions of the most profound and far-reaching significance for the Churches are to be drawn from this brief examination of Cromwell and Lenin and the eras they lived in; conclusions which go to the roots of human existence.

In Cromwell's case, the social issues which he fought were reflected in terms of a deep religious consciousness. His mind was saturated, through and through, by a sense of Divine guidance. He felt himself to be "a mean instrument". Lenin, on the contrary, was atheist and materialist. He looked upon himself as an instru-

ment of purely non-moral, social, and historic forces. The difference between the consciousness of the two men was absolutely fundamental.

Cromwell, though modern, lived in an era when the mentality of society had not yet been penetrated by the new philosophy of humanism which the Renaissance ushered into Europe. The quality and structure of men's minds was still that which Catholic Europe had created. It was the result of the faith or philosophy which took its departure from the idea of the centrality of God. In that sense, feudal Europe was deeply religious. Men saw in events the hand of God. Their consciousness was God-penetrated. Political and social issues were therefore essentially religious in their meaning and character. Cromwell was a true child of his time in his basically religious understanding and attitude.

Lenin lived nearly three hundred years later, during which interval the philosophy of humanism, which took its departure from the idea of man's centrality, had had time to work itself out in social and international life. One result (to which little attention has been paid) is that it has changed the quality and structure of man's soul. Whereas the idea of God was native to the mentality and soul of Cromwell's era, to-day, to the soul of contemporary man, it is foreign. Modern civilization, which is an embodiment of the faith that man is central and the architect of his own fate, has atomized, mechanized and depersonalized men and women. We are witnessing the rise of slave-communities, in which men have lost the consciousness of an Invisible Reality directing and controlling the march of events. Of all this Lenin is a symbol, just as Cromwell was a symbol of the other.

How is the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ facing this situation? World events are now finally disintegrating what I may describe as the materialist, atheist consciousness of modern man. The process has a good way to travel yet. Men in the mass are still a long way from realizing the inevitability of God in human life. But the process can be very considerably quickened by the Church if she interprets the meaning of events in terms which a secularized mentality can understand. And—let us face the fact—that is what the Church is not doing on anything like an adequate scale.

The difference between Cromwell and Lenin is more than a difference between two individual men, great men though they both were. It is also a difference btween two eras, between two fundamental faiths, between two philosophies. We have to recover, if mankind is to survive at all, the consciousness of Cromwell without losing the scientific realism of Lenin, which represents the permanent value of humanism.

The ultimate issue of history, fortunately, is in God's hands. Cromwell, the product of a spiritual civilization, pioneered what has

turned out to be a materialist, atheist mentality—such is the ironic, dialectical contradiction of social development. In the providence of God—such is my belief—Lenin, the product of an atheist civilization, will yet prove to have pioneered what he never dreamt of: the recovery by modern man of the idea of God as a native possession of the soul.

Christianity and Morals. By E. WESTERMARCK. Kegan Paul. 21s.

In his well-known work, *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas,* Professor Westermarck advances the theory that all morality is ultimately the expression of retributive, impartial, and altruistic emotions. This makes any absolute moral standard impossible, and morals have to be judged as sharing in the variety of man's emotional life. In his latest volume he brings this theory to bear on the teaching of Jesus in the first instance, and then on its often-mistaken development in the Christian Church. It will be seen, therefore, that his book has a position to maintain, and there is no doubt that many of Dr. Westermarck's judgments are somewhat vitiated by the quite natural prejudices which his theory fosters. At the same time no praise can be too high for the meticulous care with which he has gathered together all possible evidence for the relation between Christianity and morals. He gives chapter and verse for practically every statement that he makes, and throughout his book is a fine example of careful and impartial research. In his treatment of the ethics of Jesus he somewhat exaggerates the influence of reward and punishment, though he allows a due place for its altruism. But he shows very clearly the failure of the Church to live up to the standard and ideal of the teaching of its Master.

Dr. Westermarck emphasizes the contrast between Christ and Pauline Christianity. There would have been no Paul without Christ, but there would have been no Christianity without Paul. The trouble with Pauline Christianity is its stress on justification by faith and on the saving grace of God, and it is argued that these account for the extraordinary variation in moral standards in the Church and for the slackness which the Church overlooked. From this mainly theological treatment of the subject Dr. Westermarck then passes to consider the relation of Christianity to the regard for human life, to economics, slavery, truth, marriage, and sex relations generally. He throws a flood of light on all these subjects, and his discussion of them is as interesting as it is weighty. Many of his conclusions, however, are sad reading for Christians, especially as there is no little justification for them. He says, for example,

> war is a rock on which Christian principles have suffered the most miserable shipwreck.

And, again,

> it has taken nearly 2,000 years for the married woman to get back that personal independence which she enjoyed under the Roman law, but lost through the influence which Christianity exercised on European legislation, and it may be truly said that she has regained it, not by the aid of the Churches, but despite their opposition.

Many other such judgments might be quoted, and the whole effect of Dr. Westermarck's book is to warn Christians generally of the need for a return to the moral teaching of Jesus and to beware of the ecclesiastical interpretations which have often been put upon it.

W. B. SELBIE.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

SUNDAY SCHOOL WORK ON THE NEW ESTATES

By W. E. Harding, M.A., B.D.

Around every great city in the country, and every considerable town, new estates are springing up in great numbers and with great rapidity. The result is a movement of population and a segregation of classes which together present the churches with a new problem, the urgency of which is plain to all. Mr. Arthur Black, at the request of the General Purposes Committee of the National Free Church Council, produced last November a survey of the situation, entitled *New Housing Estates in England and Wales and Free Church Extension,* which is worthy of close study. Let me take one point only. Mr. Black surveys the situation in thirteen chief provincial cities, each with a population of over 250,000, and sums up the position thus:

> It would appear from advice given me locally and from information from denominational headquarters that on the outskirts of these thirteen cities there is room and need for some 88 Free churches, schools, chapels, or mission halls. For these, 15 sites have so far been acquired or reserved. On some of them buildings are going up.

This reveals a situation which challenges all the Free Churches, and as one who lives in the midst of the challenge, and has had to learn a few fundamental things by a process of trial and error, it may be possible for me to give one or two pointers as to how the situation may be faced.

The city wherein my field lies is Birmingham, where, as Mr. Black points out, more than 29,000 new houses have been built in the last three years. Many of these are on estates developed by speculative builders, but the Corporation itself has built very extensively. The

City of Birmingham Handbook, published in 1938, gives some striking figures. It states that "Up to the 30th June, 1937, 45,834 houses had been erected by the Corporation—a further 3,622 houses have been tendered for and are under construction". Under the 1930 Housing Act, a scheme has been embarked upon "for the demolition of some 10,000 unfit dwelling houses, which, with adjustments to eliminate overcrowding, means the provision of about 12,000 new dwellings". For this, "many hundreds of acres of land in the outer districts" have been purchased, by agreement or compulsion. This is a five year scheme which in itself will involve a transfer of population of about 50,000, of which about 17,000 have already been transferred. A rough and ready survey of recent new areas, both municipal and speculative, reveals something like fifty estates, encircling the city, varying in size from 1,000 to 10,000 houses.

These facts and figures will serve to indicate something of the magnitude of the problem which confronts the Free Churches of the city.

The church of which I am the minister is within striking distance of some of the new estates growing up on the fringe of the city; within the last fifteen years it has assisted at the birth of three new causes, for the first two of which I was in no way responsible as they took place before I came to the neighbourhood. I am also the secretary of an interdenominational committee for Free Church extension in the city. I propose to write only of the experience gained by my church, and by this committee.

About nine years ago, a charming expanse of fields and woodland, containing three or four farms, was converted into a municipal estate considerably larger than the town of Shrewsbury. This estate, called Kingstanding, second only to Dagenham in size in this country, houses about 40,000 people. A group of Congregational churches in the district, including Erdington, feeling the challenge that this implied, with the aid of the Church Extension Committee of the Birmingham District of the Congregational Union got in touch with the Town Planning Department, and after some difficulty secured a site, bought it, and put up a temporary building in the form of a hut to hold about 250 people. Here, with the aid of helpers from the churches, a Sunday School was opened. Evening services had already been started in a nearby house, and a young man who was studying for the ministry took charge of the services and started a Scout Troop under a lamp-post. Services were now held in the hut. Then one of our big central churches, Steelhouse Lane, was sold, and money became available for permanent buildings. A minister was secured for the cause, and building began. Magnificent school premises were put up, including an assembly room to hold 600 children; a handsome church was built, and also a caretaker's house. Grants were made from the Warwickshire Union and the Central Fund, as

well as from the Steelhouse Lane money; the Soho Hill Church made grants of £200 a year for two years. Then the main hall was let as an Employment Exchange, and the denominational funds were no longer required. This church now has a membership roll of 98, and 412 scholars on its books.

A few comments may be made and some queries indicated.

1. A clear need was revealed for an arrangement with the City Surveyor that when a new estate was planned a site should be reserved and offered to a Free Church. This would have avoided much unnecessary delay.
2. Such an effort was a great venture of faith, but its financial basis was—and remains—precarious. Clearly what is needed is not only money for site, building, and equipment, but an endowment of a substantial amount for running costs, since a church in an area inhabited almost entirely by working class people cannot hope to be self-supporting.
3. The building of such a large main hall, not only very costly in itself, but costly to heat and light, is very difficult to defend. What purpose can it serve? Its only real justification would be that it was required for the Sunday School. But modern Sunday School methods do not call for a great hall, since the work is done in departments.
4. Whether the building of a separate church on this type of estate can be justified or not is a very debatable point. Might not a building on the lines of a Central Mission be more suited to the needs of the district?
5. In practice it was revealed that, in spite of much excellent and devoted work done by outside helpers, more especially from the Soho Hill and Aston Park Churches, the attempt at co-operation by several churches was unsatisfactory, and in the end the church was left very largely to its own resources, with a grave lack of leadership. The lack of a sense of responsibility among the people on the spot in the early days was a distressing feature.

In 1928 the Erdington church held its Centenary, and resolved, among a number of other things, to carry out church extension in the neighbourhood as an expression of thanksgiving. Another new estate, much smaller than Kingstanding, but of considerable size, was being developed by the Corporation in another direction about a mile away from the church, at Pype Hayes. A Council School was being built, and the church arranged to rent it on Sunday afternoons and evenings. A circular was sent round stating that on the Sunday after the school was opened, a Sunday School would be held there. Three or four people went down to see what happened and take charge. Five hundred children turned up, and the scene was memorable. The three or four helpers returned, living, but only just, and

an S.O.S. went out to the church. The following Sunday, in response to this challenge, the two senior classes went down in a body some forty strong, and took the matter in hand. They got their teeth into it, and for five years went down regularly. Gradually they secured helpers and grew teachers on the spot. When I came, six years ago, there were still about 20 of the original helpers at work. On the Sunday after the school started, evening services were begun, and a Council formed to be responsible. A small company was gradually collected. Then one day the minister went out and came back with a promise of £10,000 for a new building, a half share of the late Joseph Hood's estate, and the search for a site began. Pype Hayes estate is built on the edge of much excellent property, and it was decided to build just off the estate, and endeavour to draw into the new church the wealthier people of the neighbourhood, as well as those on the estate. A handsome church was built, with school premises adjoining. But the accommodation of the school was quite inadequate for the number of scholars attending, nor was it built on the lines of a graded school. The church building was pressed into service, and many of the scholars still had to meet in the Council School. An additional building had to be provided, but in spite of this the church is still used to help to house the Sunday School, and it is impossible for all the five departments to be developed. None the less, in 1930 a minister was called, grants were made from the Church Extension Committee, and the County Union and Central Funds, and the work went forward. The key positions in both church and school were filled by leaders provided by the mother church, and wise counsels prevailed. A membership roll was formed, and several members transferred from the mother to the daughter church. But the two churches still remain one. Membership of either carries membership of both, the ministers are co-pastors of the two churches, and a very close spirit of kinship is retained. From the call of the minister the mother church gave financial assistance over a period of five years, commencing with £100, and gradually diminishing. The church membership roll now stands at 135, and the scholars on the books number 330. A few key positions are still filled by those from the mother church, but not more than a dozen are regularly in work in this way.

Again a few comments may be made:

1. The problem of securing a site was still a very real one, and caused anxiety and delay.
2. The school premises were once again built without consultation with Sunday School experts, and without an adequate vision of the need.
3. The fact that one church was responsible stirred that church to its foundations, and with stubborn pride it held the fort and saw the matter through, and so the problem of lack of

leadership has never arisen in an acute form. Moreover, the spiritual and financial backing of the mother church has always been available and used.

4. In an area much smaller than Kingstanding, the church is in a stronger and sounder financial and numerical position today than the Kingstanding church, although it started later. This is no criticism of the Kingstanding church, which still has a much bigger scope than Pype Hayes, and, having by now overcome many of its initial difficulties, is moving forward very hopefully.
5. The mother church derived great spiritual blessing from the venture.

In July, 1936, I received a letter from the then secretary of the Interdenominational Commitee for Free Church Extension in Birmingham, asking if the Erdington Church would be interested in securing a site that was being offered by the Corporation on a new municipal estate which was to be built on an open space in yet another direction, about three-quarters of a mile from the church. This would be an estate of nearly a thousand houses at New Oscott, and adjoined an existing municipal estate of some seven hundred houses. I brought the matter before the deacons, who felt deeply concerned about it, but wished to make further inquiries, particularly as our commitments at Pype Hayes were still considerable. Pype Hayes, however, rose splendidly to the occasion, and said that if there were a chance of our starting a new cause, they would undertake not to come on us for any further financial help. But the Union would not commit themselves to anything and the Church Extension Committee had come to the end of their money. By November we called a special Deacons' Meeting and decided that if we could go forward we should, but we must not go heavily into debt, and must strive to get outside help for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building. The church was just clearing a very big debt, and urgently needed redecorating. None the less the deacons decided to put the matter before the church, and recommend that we start a Sunday School at once in a Council School on the existing estate, before the new estate was built. The church, which had just had the Inner Mission campaign, and had taken it very seriously, with remarkable unanimity expressed the opinion that we should go forward, but not run into debt. Between Christmas and the New Year, the deacons met again and arranged to get out circulars and appeal for volunteers to take them round the existing estate. The circulars inquired about the denominational allegiance of each household, the number and ages of the children, possible Christian workers and leaders, and stated that a Sunday School would be opened in the near future. On the evening of the first Sunday in January, at a Young People's Dedication service I appealed for volunteers to do this work and to take up teaching and

leadership. I was gratified to get over twenty names. As a result of the subsequent canvass, twelve possible teachers were discovered on the estate. On January 12th, at a meeting of volunteers, the staff of the whole school of three departments, including departmental leaders, secretaries, and pianists were arranged. A second canvass was at once planned and carried out, stating that the School would open on February 14th. On that day 200 children came to rooms that were already prepared, where a staff of forty teachers and leaders awaited them, including leaders for each department on loan from our own school, enrolment was quickly carried out, and school sessions were held. This was followed up a month later by evening services, under a Committee of Management of six people from the mother church, three of them deacons. Lay preachers supplied the pulpit, and the voluntary services of a retired minister were secured for visiting and occasional preaching. The new estate is now built and largely occupied; the first Communion Service of the new cause has been held, and the first group of members received. The Sunday School, after falling in numbers to 150, is now well above 200 again, and growing weekly. The site offered by the Corporation was withdrawn, but an alternative offered. The Church Extension Committee has undertaken its purchase and is launching a new appeal to raise funds for this and another site and to build three new churches. The mother church has undertaken the running costs. We get the hire of the school on the Sunday afternoon for about ten shillings a week, and the weekly collections go a good way towards covering this. The cost of the hire of the room for evening service is a more serious matter. We are now urgently in need of our own building, both for evening service and the development of weeknight activities. The weekly teachers' training classes, sewing meeting, and the Christmas parties are held on the premises of the mother church.

Again a few comments may not be amiss :

1. The fact that there was one mother church primarily concerned ensured interest, backing, and leadership.
2. After nine years a new generation of young people was ripe to undertake this work, and did so without withdrawing one teacher from our own Sunday School.
3. Graded work and regular training classes were possible from the beginning.
4. The cost to the mother church of the Sunday School side of the work is very small.
5. A temporary building for evening services and weeknight activities becomes urgent after two years. This need not be large, as the school can continue to meet for some years in the day school.
6. The fact that a site was offered by the Corporation before the estate was built provided the stimulus to begin, and enabled

work to be put in hand before a single house on the new part of the estate was erected.

Now for a few comments of a more general nature arising out of these experiences. The problem of how to deal with a new estate varies very considerably with its type.

(*a*) There is the speculative builder, who develops an estate entirely of houses for sale, often of reasonably good quality, say of £500 to £600. On such an estate fairly normal methods of procedure are possible. A good many people will be found who have church associations, a community can be gathered, a site secured, money found, and a church and school built in good time. A mother church is certainly advisable, but the new church should soon be self-supporting in every way.

(*b*) There is the Corporation estate, built on the fringe of good private property, or with a fringe of speculative building going on round it. Pype Hayes was such an estate. Here a strategic site in contact with the whole constituency should be sought, and a church and school built. A mother church here is a practical necessity, and much guidance and help will be required. It may be quite a number of years before the residential area around is really touched, but such a church should become self-supporting in time.

(*c*) There is the large Corporation estate, consisting of thousands of houses, all of very much the same type, built often in whole or in part for slum clearance, let to working-class people with families. This is a veritable township, but with no centres of interest, no fellowship, no traditions, little or no variation of class, and variation of means only within narrow limits. Such an estate is a new phenomenon, and needs a new approach. It should be a matter of earnest consideration whether the key to the approach is not to be found in the idea of a Central Mission. In any case, can the erection of a separate church building be justified, with all the subsequent expense of upkeep that this involves? A large institutional building seems to be indicated, such as will provide for both the spiritual and social requirements of the people, and become the real centre of their corporate life. Since such a church can never be self-supporting, it should be adequately endowed, or it will be a permanent charge upon the county or district. Endowment may seem a counsel of perfection, though an institutional building may draw rent from shops. As an alternative, the churches of the city as a whole should undertake to provide an annual income, rather than the county. If a city segregates its population in classes, or allows them to be so segregated by speculative builders, the churches must accept the challenge implied, and regard the city as a unit, and the richer areas must help the poorer. It is against all Christian charity and fellowship for churches in comparatively wealthy areas to go snugly on with no responsibilities for any poor in their own

neighbourhood, and no vision of the herded poor on an estate two or three miles away. This is a real challenge, and without an adequate response to it the problem cannot be satisfactorily solved. But if the challenge is met, the situation presents no insuperable difficulties.

In such an area a mother church should be made responsible. It should be expected to do the canvassing, and run the new cause—that is provide leadership, advice, and running costs, but not the cost of purchase of a site, erection of a building, or maintenance of a minister. That is denominational responsibility. Gradually the people on the spot should relieve the mother church of their share of the cost.

The adult fellowship at the beginning will be very small. The majority of the people will have lost the church-going habit long ago. But many will come to a women's meeting during the week, and will send their children to a Sunday School, and take an interest in Sunday School activities, and gradually their numbers will increase. But in the main the new church must be grown from the Sunday School. This is a ten-year programme. After that a fine congregation of young men and women will have been gathered, as is the case now both at Kingstanding and Pype Hayes. Work can be begun in a Council School, but a building of some kind becomes rapidly and urgently necessary in addition for Sunday evening services and week-night activities. As soon as the people on the spot get a building of their own, the cause leaps forward, if it be only a wooden hut to house 100 people. The site secured should be spacious, and if possible room for a bowling green and tennis courts provided.

It is very little less than a tragedy when schools are built which are unsuitable for graded work; and yet again and again this is done. Can it be that Church Extension Committees and mother churches are still unaware of the needs of a modern Sunday School? I know of a fine new church and new schools recently built and opened, in which the school consisted of a main hall and a lot of little class-rooms round it, with sliding doors. It was fifty years out-of-date on the day it was opened. The minimum requirements for properly graded work, on which all progressive Sunday Schools are based, are a main hall of moderate size with four class rooms for the Senior department, and grouped around it four middle sized rooms, each with its own cloak room accommodation for Beginners, Primary, Junior, and Intermediate departments. In addition there should be general cloak room and kitchen accommodation. Such a building might be put up a department at a time, beginning with the main hall, and the expense of a temporary building saved. The Weoley Castle Church in Birmingham is such a building. But the photographs and plans of new schools in the *Congregational Year Books* of recent years do not reveal many such. The Sunday School Union will always give

advice as to the types of building required, and will recommend architects who understand the needs.

A word about the mother church may be in place here. I consider a mother church to be such a vital necessity that I should not care to be responsible for starting a new cause, except perhaps in an estate of good-class private property, without one. Such a church should be not more than a mile away, and should be reasonably strong, but need not be of great strength. If it is a missionary-minded church it will appreciate the call of home missions. In most such churches there are fifteen to twenty young men and women, not engaged in the school, who would rise to a challenge and answer a call, and with warm encouragement from their church, could be counted on to see the venture through. The financial cost to the mother church of a new school would be very small. Schools can be hired for afternoon Sunday School at a cost which a weekly collection from the children will largely cover. What is needed is a concern and vision and faith. The preliminary canvass is very important. It should be comprehensive and result in a fairly complete survey of the possibilities. Subsequent visitation and nursing of the new community is also important. As soon as possible responsibilities should be placed on the people on the spot. Six adults, and fifteen to twenty young people, with a sympathetic church behind them, could see through the establishing of a cause on an estate of between one and two thousand houses.

Now about the central organization that is needed to back up such work done by individual churches.

Most denominations in a city like Birmingham are awake to the challenge of the new areas, and have their Church Extension Committees and Forward Movements. In Birmingham the Congregational Church Extension Committee has spent since the war over £100,000 on church extension. Some of this money was already in the hands of individual churches; some came through the sale of a central church; some from various trusts. Much was specially raised. With this money the denomination has built eight new churches with schools and five new halls or schools. It is now setting out to raise a further sum to continue the good work. The Baptist denomination has done rather more, the Methodists considerably more, and the Presbyterians and Society of Friends have also been active. Congregationalism is notoriously badly off for central funds, but the National and County Unions administer considerable sums for maintenance every year. The Sunday School Union makes small grants, and this Union and the Chapel Building Fund will loan money free of interest over a period of years, provided that regular repayments are made. Where the denominations really face their responsibilities, pace can be kept with the city's growth and the new estates provided for, even in a rapidly growing city like Birmingham.

The Interdenominational Committee for Free Church Extension is also very important. It is entirely without funds, and without coercive power, and yet it does a most valuable work. It has arranged with the City Surveyor that when any new municipal estate is planned, a site shall be reserved and offered to the Committee. The Committee decides if it is too near existing work. If so it surrenders the site. If not, it offers it to a likely mother church, and if no such church can be found, to any denomination that can take it up. If no denomination is prepared to do this, it is surrendered. The price of the site is the average cost per yard of the estate to the Corporation. The purpose of the Committee is to encourage new work and avoid Free Church overlapping. Any church or denomination in the area that contemplates new extension work informs the secretary, and the Committee either sanctions the work, or reports that Free Church work is already going on in the neighbourhood, and asks them to look elsewhere. Where overlapping is seriously threatened, it brings the two parties together, and tries to arrange a workable compromise. The idea is that we do not take Congregationalism or Methodism or any other denomination to these areas, but a Free Church. Denominational machinery has to be used, of course, since union has not yet come among the Free Churches, but for the new areas the practical results of union are achieved. One great advantage results from such a committee. If a church undertakes work in response to its appeal, it is in the position of having been officially asked to do so by the properly constituted body, and the denomination is morally bound to support it to the limit of its ability when support is required. Moreover, the church will normally start with a site actually in prospect, which is a great incentive. In Birmingham this Committee is a subcommittee of the Free Church Council, to which it reports annually; its personnel is drawn from the Church Extension Committees of the various denominations in proportion to their strength, plus a representative from the Council. The denominations represented are the Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and the Society of Friends.

In conclusion, one may say that the whole matter is one of a real concern, adequate organization, and faith. Without any one of these ingredients the work cannot go forward and prosper. With them all difficulties can be overcome.

If we do not claim these new areas in Christ's name, someone else will claim them in another name. The Christian Church faces a great challenge and a great opportunity. It is strong enough to meet the one and seize the other. Let it go forward and the way will open out. Faith like a grain of mustard seed will move mountains, because the mountains are mere figments of an intimidated imagination. The proper place for such mountains now as always is in the sea.

DO SUNDAY SCHOOLS MEET BOYS' NEEDS?[1]

By the Rev. JAMES BUTTERWORTH
(*Warden of Clubland Church, London*).

THE fight for the future of the boy is not as to whether he is to go to the Sunday school, because he never will go. You can grade your Sunday schools as much as you like, but you will never catch the modern boy. Only one per cent of boys go to Sunday school. We are concerned with the ninety-nine per cent. The need is for spiritualizing the whole of the boy's life in every department.

My judgment is that Sunday schools were designed for a past age, and are not meant for this age. They were all right when they were the only open doors to a working boy's friendships and his only escape to any sort of social life. But to-day the wireless, motor-coaches, clubs, cinemas, youth hostels, playing fields, and civic and educational facilities offer him a fuller life.

There are many reasons given for the decline of Sunday schools, but nobody seems to face up to the fact that the working boy won't go, and, unlike the generation of the past, the parents are not prepared to make him go. If Robert Raikes were alive to-day there is not a Sunday school in the land where he would be welcome, because his whole life-story shows that he instituted Sunday schools to serve his own age and its special circumstances and conditions. Therefore Robert Raikes would make his institution serve *this* age. Public opinion "down our street" says that no self-respecting boy is seen anywhere near a Sunday school. It just isn't done to belong to "kids' shows". The lads in his district and his work-mates make this sort of attachment *taboo*.

Why is it that so few children go willingly and escape so regularly? The Church is losing all contact with the working boy—it is with him I am personally concerned—and all contact with the public schoolboy also, for ex-public schoolboys desirous of expressing their religion find that sitting in a pew or engaging in church activities cramps their style, narrows their point of view, and offers them no service commensurate with their public school training. These boys—public school boys—and the working boys, for different reasons, having been pushed out of Church, are now meeting on common ground outside the Church. In clubs of all kinds, which through national and other agencies are springing up at the rate of one a week, these two classes are sharing interests, developing character and living normal, healthy lives.

It will be said, I know, by good church folk, that clubs do not

[1] This article, which appeared in the form of an interview in the *Methodist Recorder*, appeared to us of such importance that we have obtained the permission of Mr. Butterworth and the Editors of the *Methodist Recorder* to reproduce it.—EDITOR.

go far enough. I admit it, but would add that the Church does not go any distance at all, and is quite unaware of the existence of these youngsters. It is no mean thing, and is also far better, to have got gangs into some kind of recreational and cultural communities than to have left them to street evils and juvenile crime.

But I hear someone say: "What nonsense! How can the Churches run such clubs without money?" There are medical students and others who are running such clubs in their spare time in disused factories, public houses, and warehouses for about £200 a year. Many big chapels with congregations from twenty to fifty, cost very much more to run and do not serve their district at all.

My own experience showed me that circuit trustees and all manner of authorities had to be fought, and fifteen years had to pass before my clubs could be established. And what it took fifteen years to accomplish inside the Church, we are now finding it possible to accomplish in a few months outside the Church. Wouldn't Raikes be thrilled by such a fight for the world's boyhood?

The future contributions must be to spiritualize everything the boy is interested in—his sports, music, drama, pictures, art, literature, friendships. It is irrelevant, in this great issue between a spiritual and a material view of life, whether he goes to Sunday school or not. I cannot conceive more sex repressions than those which obtained in Sunday school training, for it is only when a boy can get out of that atmosphere and can take an interest in all that affects normal boys, and has opportunities of meeting girls under more normal conditions, that he learns to adjust himself to such powerful life forces and instincts. Some day it will be realized that it might be a better thing to let these youngsters dance than that they should be everlastingly brought on to church premises for dull religious meetings and tame social functions. In other words, to do what the better class churchfolk are doing with their own children in their own homes, or at least have the opportunity of doing.

If many of our empty chapels are not going to be turned into youth centres and are to be closed, and the Sunday school in some form is to be retained, then I would suggest three things. First, that all who presume to teach boys should be interested in what boys are interested in. Such teachers would do well to go running with them, attend their sports, and indeed do what any father would do. Thus we should find out how many teachers are really interested in their boys, or whether they are more interested in giving them their own mature religious experiences. It would thus rule out the vast number of those suppressed and narrow-minded people who have not the slightest knowledge of a boy's normal outlook. It is tragic that youngsters should be introduced to religion by people who do not give them the thrill of life and the adventure of living.

Secondly, the boy's religious training—as with Roman Catholics —should come directly under the minister and not just anyone. The Roman Catholics have no rival to the child. The child begins *in* the Church. The pious hope of Sunday schools that its members find them a gateway into the Church is disproved by the cold fact that the bridge leads anywhere but to the Church, and by the comparatively few who are transferred. The Sunday school is so different in method and atmosphere that the Church must always seem something quite contradictory to the early training. I have always found it much easier to get the street hooligans to appreciate reverence in the Club Chapel than I did former Sunday school scholars whose sense of worship had been ruined by the rowdiness of the Sunday school.

It is essential, therefore, it seems to me, that a church's practice of the Presence of the Lord should begin by some form of Children's Church—worship in the church—for religion is not so much a question of knowledge as an attitude of life and a direction of disposition.

Thirdly, the best way to begin the more intelligent approach is from the theological colleges. After all, the students are young men, although it will take them a long time to break down the mountain of prejudice against them as parsons. One theological college wrote to me and said the men would come and help me if they could do the work for which they were being trained—religious work! I do not understand such subtle theological distinctions. Ideals are caught, not taught; and no boy is influenced by a theory—only by a person. Jesus called twelve men to be with Him, not to preach at them, and any contacts of good men with boys is a religious influence. A theological student could influence twelve street hooligans more by running the "gym" or dramatic class than by a thousand Bible classes.

It will be argued, I foresee, that students haven't time for this kind of theory. I must point out, however, that medical students and any other faculty are doing in their student days such work as I have indicated. And the best training for a theological student would be that for one night a week he should get out of his theological atmosphere and make contact with humanity, and this by not preaching at it.

We have Departments and experts in Methodism for everything except boys. Perhaps, bless 'em, they are far too cheeky and far too defiant, and parsons prefer more docile and appreciative audiences. For what happens to the bad boys is that they are usually kicked out of the Sunday school as being unmanageable. I know of no finer training for theological students than that part of their training should include contacts with boys. It will save the student in future years from stepping on to the ready-made machine of

Methodism and going through the circuit with a congregation already "saved", but diminishing. It will teach him to find his own constituency and go to homes where he will not be asked to stay for tea, and in streets where many boys may first knock off his hat.

In conclusion, if I am not thought to be practical in all this, let me make this offer and challenge, as I do not see any point in asking students and others to run Sunday schools which I do not feel have any future. I will offer the whole of the Clubland premises on one night a week to any ten theological students who will go into the tenements around here and, out of the thousands of boys, find ten boys each. That makes a Club of a hundred. They can run it exactly as they like so long as they become the "big brothers" to their ten lads. If I can get fifty "big brothers" that means five hundred boys, and I will also offer to take all the "big brothers" and their five hundred away to camp. And when their newly-formed gangs return life will never be the same again. The effect of this on housing and social relationships would be amazing. In other words, it just means a bloodless social revolution with a strong spiritual background for thousands of boys so influenced—a new outlook for the rising generation. Boy welfare simply means world welfare.

RELIGIOUS IMAGERY.

By H. N. Dixon, M.A., F.L.S.

Imagery has always been, and no doubt always will be, a valuable adjunct to religious thought. As with other ornaments and accessories, however, there is a risk of its assuming a too important place, and being looked upon as an essential. I want to suggest two or three directions in which, as it seems to me, there is some danger of our letting it dominate our thoughts too greatly.

Take, for instance, the topographical and geographical imagery which we apply to the unseen, to heaven and hell, for example. It is no doubt some help to picture these conceptions in the form of actual dwelling places; and there is some appropriateness in thinking of "the heavenly places" in terms which we apply to all "high", "lofty" ideas; and *vice versa* with regard to relegating hell among the "lower" things. But, as a matter of fact, our use of the terms is probably not derived from such parallels; they are a survival of the elaborate Hebraic ideas of the various circles of heaven, and are fostered by the very materialized imagery of *Revelation*, of Dante, and of Milton. I do not think it is too much to say that among the less thoughtful of our people vast numbers actually think of heaven as a definite place, located somewhere above. This is hardly to be wondered at when we remember how our children are nurtured on hymns such as

There's a Friend for little children
Above the bright blue sky . . .

Far above in highest heaven . . . .

Beyond, beyond that boundless sea,
Above that dome of sky,
Farther than thought itself can flee,
Thy dwelling is on high.

Here not only is there an insistence on heaven being a place above the clouds but the still more undesirable conception of its being a place "far, far away".

I do not suggest scrapping such hymns, though a few of them, I think, might well be allowed to "join the majority". (I wonder if anyone has ever computed the number of dead and buried hymns? However great the number there is room in the cemetery for a good many more!) But they should be used sparingly, and I could wish that future hymn-writers would avoid too definite geographical directions.

Bound up with this is a great deal of very material imagery as to the future state, which has become incorporated into our habits of thought until, in many minds certainly, it has become inseparable from their thought-pictures of the future life. Perhaps the most deeply ingrained is the idea of the "musical" heaven.

O when shall I in endless day
For ever chase dark sleep away,
And hymns with the supernal choir
Incessant sing, and never tire?

By day, by night, the sacred courts
With glad hosannas ring.

It is not easy to trace the origin of this particular form of imagery. It has pervaded our hymnody for centuries. The four and twenty elders in *Revelation,* and the hundred and forty-four thousand of the redeemed, indeed, sing a new song before the throne, but that can scarcely explain, or justify, the thought in such hymns as those quoted. Probably it has arisen from an association of ideas with the singing of angelic songs in heaven. But whence was that idea derived? We sing of

The song of the angels.

The blessed angels sing.

Hark, the herald angels sing.

It came upon the midnight clear
That glorious song of old;

and so on. Probably most of us really know, when we sing thus, that the foundation for this imagery is unscriptural; that the

scriptural account of the herald angels says quite definitely that they were "praising God and *saying*". It is, I think, quite comprehensible and not at all unjustifiable that we should have sublimated the rather plain statement, as we have done. But it would surprise a good many to be told that from beginning to end of the Scriptures there is not a single instance given of angelic singing; that so far as scriptural authority goes we have no justification whatever for speaking of an angelic choir—no, not a duet, not even a solo! The nearest approach to anything of the sort, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is the blowing of the trumpets by the angels in *Revelation*. Now the blowing of a trumpet, though it requires a considerable amount of skill and practice, does not, I believe, presuppose any degree of musical ability. It might even be argued that the Scriptures manifest an evident mistrust of the musical gifts of the angelic host. At that supreme moment, when all the stars sang together, it might be supposed that then, at least, the angels would burst forth into song; but no, "all the sons of God *shouted* for joy". Surely if they had any music in them they would have sung! But without pressing this I would point out that the fact remains that we have no authority in Holy Writ for crediting the angels with melody; and when we write and sing of

> Angel voices, ever singing.
> And ever o'er its babel sounds
> The blessed angels sing.
>
> Angels of Jesus, angels of light,
> Singing to welcome the pilgrims of the night.
>
> There evermore the angels sit,
> And evermore do sing—

(it is astonishing, in looking through our hymnaries, what a large number of hymns make use of this pleasing, but quite unauthorized imagery) we are enunciating an entirely anthropomorphic conception of the angelic state!

I was once staying at a hotel in France with the late Dean of Bristol, then Canon of Westminster. When it was reported that a Canon of Westminster was coming to the hotel there was some stir, since it was hoped that it might prove to be Canon Barnes, who was just then electrifying the world, or, alternatively, stirring up the dovecotes of the Church, by his utterances. An inquisitive clergyman told me that he had made inquiries of the Canon, on his arrival, saying, "I understand that you are a Canon of Westminster; a Minor Canon, I presume?" "No", said Dr. De Candole, very tactfully, "I fear I have not the musical qualifications for a Minor Canon". Sir Thomas Malory tells how four angels came from heaven on one occasion "clothed in the likeness of bishops" (one is glad he did not say

"disguised"). If the angel Gabriel (why will some people persist in calling him an archangel?) appeared on one of his gracious errands from heaven, clothed in ecclesiastical raiment, and if he, too, were to be asked if he were a Minor Canon, it is somewhat of a comfort to think he could truthfully, as well as tactfully, make the same reply as Dr. De Candole!

If then the idea that the occupation of the redeemed in the life to come is to be a perpetual exercise of the voice in music, accompanied, according to some authorities, though according to others unaccompanied, if this idea is really based, to some extent at least, on a misreading of Scripture as to the angelic band, might it not be slightly relaxed in favour of some of us to whom it makes, perhaps, a less lofty appeal than to others?

In considering these questions we have to bear in mind that the younger generations are, unfortunately, less steeped in the language and pictorial imagery of the Bible than has been the case for several centuries; and what has fallen on the ears of us of an older generation as the most natural and obvious imagery may easily come as a shock to those less familiar with biblical metaphor; or at least may jar on their sensitiveness. This is particularly likely to be the case with imagery applied to the Divine person. Many of us remember the old woodcuts in the Family Bible, where God the Father was depicted as a benevolent old gentleman with a flowing beard, and the Holy Spirit as a dove, conceived in a theological rather than an ornithological mould. We have out-grown these, but we are, surely, rather too much inclined to perpetuate certain other allegorical references, notably that of the Lamb, as applied to Christ. To the Jews, accustomed to the ideal of a material sacrifice, it came quite naturally; on our ears, even those of us well accustomed to it, it often jars. How it appeals to those less or not accustomed is perhaps best realized if we try to put ourselves in their place. It may come home to us by recalling how in one of the South Sea Islands when the missionaries wished to translate the passage "Behold the Lamb of God" into the native vernacular, and there were no such things as lambs on the island and no word for them, they were obliged to use the only comprehensible term, and their translation ran (literally translated) "Behold the pig of God". We need to be very cautious about our use of a metaphor that may make the same jarring impression on some minds that this would make on us.

One of the most distasteful forms of religious metaphor in its too lavish use is that of "the Blood". Public taste and feeling has in recent times been quickened in this direction, and there is no need, perhaps, to labour it. We have purged our hymns of some of their most sanguinary expressions, but I fear there are still a good number of preachers and hymn singers who revel in this imagery. There are

many who can sing, without turning a hair, of children "Bathed in that precious, purple flood", and who rejoice in the refrain

O wash me in Thy precious blood,
And take my sins away.

Our imagery with regard to the Devil is varied and picturesque. If our ideas of God are often anthropomorphic, our conception of the Devil is, if I may coin a word, rather theromorphic. He is a dragon, he is the serpent, he goes about like a roaring lion; and if we manage to sublimate most of these ideas out of him, in the last resort he always bears the cloven hoof. I do not know that there is any harm in this. Whatever our individual views of the personality of the Devil, it is a presentation that is most helpful, even necessary, to our thought about evil; and one in which we are encouraged by Scripture. And at least there is nothing as shocking and degrading to our feelings in conceiving of the Devil as one of the lower and bestial forms of life as there is in picturing the Almighty under any created form.

To sum up, I am, as I have said, not advocating any drastic sweeping away of our religious imagery. I only suggest that in many cases a more restrained employment of it is desirable; that in some forms it may be actually repugnant; and that wherever by too frequent use it is in danger of becoming stereotyped, so that we even cease to recognize that it *is* imagery, it should be severely checked.

The late Sir Henry Jones in a letter to his son in India wrote that "our minds are often determined by our metaphors". That is sound doctrine. It is a process against which we need very carefully to guard ourselves. We need to put ourselves in the place of the child, of the man in the street, of the non-Christian in the mission field; and we should be very tender over their non-familiarity with images and thought-forms that may be matters of everyday experience with us. And apart from them, do we not need to take heed, lest, like Plato's watchers in the cave, we familiarize ourselves so closely with the shadow that it may become for us the reality?

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.[1]

A HOLIDAY PARABLE

(With Apologies to all Senior Deacons)

And it came to pass that in the month of August, being sore oppressed with many toils, I said to my friend Josiah, "I will e'en go for the space of a few days to the land of the lakes". And Josiah said, "Go not; for lo, I went last year for a fortnight, and the first week was wet and rainy and the second was rainy and wet".

But I listened not to the counsel of Josiah and the old men who gathered with him, for I listened to the words of the young, who threatened me with whips and scorpions if I went not. And, behold! the sun rose in his might, and flooded lake-land with light and beauty, and I was exceeding glad. And it was given me to see many sights and to meet many people, and to ponder on many things. For I lifted mine eyes unto the mountains and thought on all the wonders of God, and I looked down from their summits and saw the kingdoms of the world and the glories thereof stretched before me, and it was all very good. Concerning these things my spirit rejoiced within me, but concerning some of the men I met I was sore perplexed. For lo! I climbed the mount of Skiddaw, which the natives call Skidder, and as I sat at the half-way hut drinking the fruit of the—lemon, there stumbled in a weary traveller, with a burden on his back, a coat on his arm, and perspiration on his brow. And he spake and told me a strange thing, that he had cycled from the land of Cheshire, and was tired, and, therefore, that day for a rest he was climbing Skiddaw!

There are three things too wonderful for me, yea, four that I know not, and the greatest of these is why God made some people. He who runs may read why He made Crummock Water, and heather, and the evening sky, and it may be conjectured why He made motor charabancs and flies, clouds that obscure the view, and this weary traveller. But why did He make Duncan the Deacon, unless it were to show the truth of the words spoken by the wise men of Lancashire, that there's "nowt so queer as folk". For it came to pass that Duncan the Deacon spake with me one Sabbath, and thereafter whenever opportunity offered, which was when I could not escape him. But though at times I escaped him by day, I could not do so by night; yea, in my dreams he did trouble me. For oftentimes, after going to and fro in the earth, like Satan, during the day, I feasted too sumptuously at night, and then in my sleep Duncan stood before me.

My first acquaintance with him, however, was on this wise. It was the Sabbath of the Lord, and I had entered into the holy place of the Baptgationalists with a company keeping holy day. And on my right in the sanctuary sat a little man with sunken eyes and thin, straight lips, whose spirit seemed troubled within him. For behold! he muttered continually, though the words that came from his mouth were neither "Hallelujah", nor "Praise the Lord", which are in the Hebrew tongue one and the same. For when the priest spake and said: "Let us repeat the General Confession", there came from my right no confession, but the words, "He's a Romanist".

1 Recent research has disclosed this "Holiday Parable". It bears a not unfamiliar signature, "Bob P.", but it evidently dates from some time ago, for now there is a motor road down Honister, and obviously there are no deacons, senior or otherwise, like Duncan.—Editor.

And behold! when the priest, who had evidently spent the week on the hill sides, quoted the words of the prophet John the Ruskin, saying: "The spirit of God is around you in the air that you breathe, His glory is the light that you see, and in the fruitfulness of the earth and the joy of its creatures. He has written for you day by day His revelation, as He has granted you day by day your daily bread", my neighbour did not say "Amen", but "He's a Pantheist". And lo! when the voice of the preacher spake to the children, telling them that many little ones are starving in the lands afar off, from my right came the response, "He's a Bolshevik".

And it seemed I had come to hear a remarkable preacher, who was at the same time Romanist and Pantheist and Bolshevist, and methought I would write to the *Christian World*, and ask if this was the kind of man usually turned out by the Colleges.

But at that moment the preacher opened the Scriptures, and when the eyes of all were fastened on him, he read the letter to the Hebrews, which, he said, was not the writing of Paul the Apostle.

And straightway my fellow-worshipper was seized with groanings that could scarce be uttered, but from his murmurings I deciphered the words, "Higher Critic". And I prayed in my heart that it had been the time that is called the Convention, and then maybe the groaner would have been at peace. But I greatly doubt it.

And lo! the service ended, and he told me that he was Duncan, the senior deacon of the church that is called Zion, in the city of Sootboro'. And straightway I determined to add a petition for the minister of that church to my nightly prayers for those afflicted in mind, body, or estate. And while I mused on Duncan he went down to his house justified, having worshipped God.

And when night came I dreamed a dream, and behold! I was at a country fair. And there in the midst stood the senior deacon, and in his hand were several rubber rings. And lo, in front of him was a goose, and Duncan threw a ring with a mighty throw, endeavouring to ring the goose's neck. And the ring outsped the mark by many yards. And Duncan said, "Ah, I would like that goose for supper", and he threw another ring, for if he could but encircle the neck he would possess the goose. And this ring fell short by many yards. And yet a third ring did Duncan throw, and it seemed as if success would crown his effort. But as the ring fell the goose twisted its neck, and the ring fell on the ground. And Duncan said, "Tut", and cried with a loud voice for three more rings. And when he had thrown these in vain, and yet another three, he said: "It is cruel sport, and I will e'en write to the N.S.P.C.A. about it. For 'tis a shame to tantalize the poor birds, and then kill them after all".

And again I dreamed, and I sat on a seat on the terrace called Applethwaite, which overlooks the lake of Derwentwater, and is about 400 feet above the level of the great sea. And I looked, and behold, there approached three people. Two were ladies and the other was Duncan. And he waved his stick and shouted, "We're climbing Skiddaw". And straightway he came and sat by me. And I asked him how he was and he said very well but that his sleep went from him (but his wife told me privately that if he did not sleep more than 10 hours a day he called it insomnia). And while we spake he lifted up his eyes, and lo, the lake was before him, and he said: "This is as good a view as we shall get further up. To all intents and purposes this is the top." And he took out his diary and wrote: "Climbed Skiddaw. Hard work. Lovely view". But he did not mention the 2,600 feet that were still above him. For he said: "This is a grand climb. I'll tell the Young Men's Class about it next Sunday".

And I awoke, and the day was gloriously fine. And it seemed good to me to take my family for a drive to Buttermere. And as we mounted the coach I heard a voice behind me say : "It's sure to rain this afternoon, and if it keeps like this it will be too hazy to get a view", and I had no need to look round to identify Duncan.

And as we went on our way Duncan talked to the driver, who soon let him talk. And we came to the hill that leads to the Pass called Honister, and the driver said : "Get out and walk". And Duncan said : "Why?" And the driver answered : "Because people always do". And the senior deacon trudged up the hill, puffing mightily and looking neither to the right hand nor to the left, but muttering, "Disgraceful! Robbery! Extortion!" And at lunch Duncan chose the inn called X, and therefore I chose that called Y, and it was verily a good choice. And when we mounted afterwards we proceeded but a short way, and again the driver invited us to walk. And once more Duncan protested with many words. And then we began to go down the hill, and we reached the point called the Elbow of the Devil, and Duncan said to the driver : "Don't you call this drive cruel to the horses?" And the driver winked his eye, and said gruffly : "Is that why you object to walk up the hills?" And I thought of the word of the wise man, that he that winketh with the eye causeth sorrow, and a prating fool shall fall. And it was so. For in the course of time we stopped for tea, and there arose a discussion as to how far we had travelled. And one man said it was 20 miles, and Duncan responded : "Well, I've walked ten!"

And it came to pass that we had all remounted the coach save Duncan, who had stayed within for an extra cup of tea, for, said he : "When one has paid a shilling and a half for tea, it is well to have one's money's worth, else there will still be profiteering in the land." And behold! ere he came forth from the door of the inn his murmurings were heard, and our Jehu waited, whip in hand. And the first words we distinguished as he appeared in the doorway were : "One may as well walk all the way". And the driver, who had not the patience of Job, spake shortly, and said : "If that's so, we'll be off". And straightway he flicked his whip, and the horses broke into a gallop, and Duncan was left, four miles from home, with his stick waving furiously in the air.

And lo, that was the last I saw of Duncan. And I am wondering what he will say to the Young Men's Class about it.

Bob P.

World Outlook (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) is fortunate in the time of its appearance. Its seven papers are by authorities in their subject—Sir Frederick Whyte (The United States), Dr. Wickham Steed (Republican France), Mr. A. Morgan Young (Imperial Japan), Mr. C. J. S. Sprigge (Mussolini's Italy), Sir Bernard Pares (Soviet Russia), Dr. G. P. Gooch (The Third Reich—a masterly summary), and Prof. A. P. Newton (Britain and the British Commonwealth).

The eight papers in Dr. Maldwyn Edwards's *This Methodism* (Epworth Press, 5s.) deal with such topics as "John Wesley and War" (timely), "Did Methodism Prevent a Revolution?" (No, but it "softened greatly the impact of the French Revolution on English life and thought") and "Methodism and Reunion". The weakest paper is the historical survey, "The Place of Methodism in the Free Churches", in which Dr. Edwards is off his beat, as his references to the "Presbytery at Wandsworth" and the Marprelate Tracts plainly show.

WORTH NOTING FROM RECENT BOOKS.

If there can be no knowledge of matters of intention, if scientific knowledge is the only form of knowledge which is possible to us, then all human life must be the sport of a blind chance. For scientific knowledge, being instrumental knowledge, has the effect of increasing almost without limit our power to realize our intentions. But whether it is employed for good or bad purposes, for construction or for destruction, to increase happiness or to increase misery, depends upon the character of the intentions which it serves. If there can be no knowledge which enables us to unify or harmonize the very many inconsistent intentions which human beings seek to realize, then there can be no way open to us by which we can control, to the slightest extent, our own destiny or the future of the societies to which we belong. Whether the result of science will be to increase the intensity and horror of an inherently meaningless existence or will lead to peace and the increase of human happiness, must be a matter of pure chance about which we can do literally nothing at all. A belief in progress becomes almost our *credo quia impossibile,* a blind faith with no shadow of rational justification. Even if by chance it happened that human intentions did, in fact, harmonize, we should still have no justification for any belief that the general intention which succeeded in harmonizing them would be realizable in a world of mere fact to which it could have no inherent relation.

For myself, I find such a conclusion not merely abhorrent, but completely absurd. The whole history of human society disproves it. If it is true, I cannot understand how human society, which is a unity of intention, could ever have been possible at all; nor how it could have been possible for any human wisdom to achieve the reconciliation of conflicting aims by providing for the necessities of human life, and its adaptation to its material environment. Some of the wisdom, however inadequate it may be, which has made this miracle possible, has been embodied in the religious traditions of mankind. I find it difficult to believe that the accompaniment of the decay of religion in Europe by the breakdown of social cohesion with the relapse into barbarism which we are now witnessing, is a matter of the purest coincidence.

John Macmurray, *The Boundaries of Science.*

Speaking of his wife he (an old man of 74) said, "I never told anyone about it before, but I think the Lord has made her a doorkeeper. She is keeping the door for me, I saw her in a vision of the night. It was not a dream, and I could see her long white robe down to her feet. When I go I think she will open the door to me and go further in, and then I shall keep the door for someone else".

Kilvert's Diary.

The protestant type of mind lays more stress on the Atonement, the catholic on the Incarnation; the catholic mind is naturally sacramental, the protestant naturally exegetic. At this point, if not before, the significance of the distinction for poetry is manifest. I should say that Keats' poetry is sacramental, and Milton's is not. Keats' poetry is charged with warmth and mystery, like a pulse in the blood, while Milton's is not. Keats was not a professed Christian while Milton was; yet Keats, I should say, was more a naturally Christian poet than Milton.

J. Middleton Murry, *Studies in Keats, New and Old.*

AMSTERDAM: AN OECUMENICAL MILESTONE

By The Rev. J. W. A. SINGLETON, B.A.

"Oecumenical" is an ugly word with a lovely meaning. Originally it signified "belonging to the habitable world", *i.e.*, the world which was given its order by the rule of Rome. Later it developed a Christian connotation and came to mean "that which is representative of the Church in its entirety", and as such was applied to the early Councils of the undivided Church. To-day the word has come to have special reference to the great new movement for unity amongst the non-Roman Catholic Churches of the world. It is synonymous with "catholic", but that term is understood by most people in a special sense, and with "universal", which is rather hackneyed and smacks of a chain of grocery stores.

Amsterdam was my first adventure into the land of Oecumenism, and as I found myself woefully ignorant of its history and am not modest enough to believe myself the only "benighted" traveller, I will preface my observations on the World Conference of Christian Youth by a brief Baedeker-like introduction to this Land of Promise. An oecumenical impulse has come to Christendom from three sides in the main: from the evangelical missionary movement; from the desire of certain men and women in the Church to "do something" with regard to the revival of paganism in the world; and from Christian youth organizations like the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., and the W.S.C.F.

To understand Amsterdam aright, then, I must go to Edinburgh. There in 1910 a Conference was held, and in it was born the International Missionary Council, directed by Dr. John R. Mott, "Father Oecumenical", who, incidentally, was a speaker at Amsterdam. It is in the mission field that the scandal of the divisions of Christendom makes itself felt most cruelly. Why should the splits of the West be perpetuated in the East? At Jerusalem in 1928 inter-Church "Christian Councils" were set up in the Orient and in Africa, and mission work in the world organized to prevent overlapping. Madras, 1938, was the third panel in the triptych of evangelical missionary Councils, when 400 delegates from 64 different countries attended.

Parallel with this effort at missionary collaboration, concern was being felt within the churches as to the influence which they could exercise on international relations in a world dominated by conflicts between the rival interests of States moved by national egoism, prestige, and force. Two complementary Conferences were to be held in August, 1914, one at Liége for the Roman Catholics and the other at Constance for the rest of the Churches. Only the latter took place, and on the eve of the Great War passed a manifesto which constitutes a challenge to war and is the charter of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches. The activities of the Alliance have greatly multiplied since then, and every three years there are International Council meetings in different countries. The aim of the Alliance is

> to work within Churches of all confessions so that they may develop relations of confidence and solidarity with the Churches of other countries, give one another mutual assistance, and affirm together, before the world, their will to peace—a peace which must be based upon the principles of justice demanded by the Gospel, and not on violence, unstable compromise, or any human ideology.

The churches as such were thus engaged only indirectly in the oecumenical movement through the agencies of the World Alliance and the International Missionary Council. It will be the function of the World Council of Churches, now in process of formation, to bring about an official collaboration of the Churches, a common action towards Christian unity in the realm of faith and in the application of Christian principles in the world. To this end a provisional committee was charged in 1938 to prepare the way for this new body and to combine in it the heritage of two parallel organs of the oecumenical movement: "The Universal Christian Council for Life and Work", and the "Faith and Order" movement.

The former, as we all know, was due to the initiative of the late Archbishop Söderblom, and aims at a larger objective than the World Alliance, bringing the whole field of social and moral questions within its purview. It was a result of the Stockholm Conference of 1925, and prepared for and organized the conference on "Church, Community and State" at Oxford in 1937. From 1932 to 1938 the Universal Christian Council and the World Alliance had the same general secretary and united their resources to set up the International Christian Press and Information Service, to publish a modest periodical, *The Churches in Action*, and to develop the action of their joint Youth Commission, which was responsible for the Church representation at Amsterdam. The aim of the "Faith and Order" movement, which owes its inspiration to Edinburgh 1910, seeks for unity, not in common action, but in the very principles of the Church. Its first oecumenical conference was at Lausanne in 1927, and it met again ten years later at Edinburgh.

Amsterdam stands in direct succession to these great Conferences, the last "flaming milestone" on the oecumenical trail. It differs from all of them, however, in several respects. First, it was a youth conference. All delegates were under 35 and the average age was about 26. Second, no other Conference has had such a representative backing. The world organizations forming the committee which three years ago began preparing the Conference are the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches (in process of formation), the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, the World's Young Women's Christian Association, and the World's Student Christian Federation. The last three, some of whose members scarcely believe in the Church as an institution, supplied half the delegates and the youth departments of the Churches the other half. The International Missionary Council, the World Conference on Faith and Order, the World's Sunday School Association, and the International Society of Christian Endeavour collaborated.

Altogether at Amsterdam there were 1,350 official delegates from 71 countries representing 220 separately organized religious groups and national Churches. No continent lacked representation. It is doubtful whether any other representative gathering has ever brought together as great a number of official delegates from as many countries under any auspices, on any occasion, anywhere else in the world, not excepting the meetings of the League of Nations. Never before on the continent of Europe had a greater number of non-English speaking nationals come together. More than 500 came from 20 nations. Interestingly enough, on no occasion in the U.S.A. has so large a number of American religious organizations been represented at a conference. The presence of so many and so varied people at such a time of international chaos and crisis as ours is, testifies to the power of Christ, to-day as yesterday, to draw all men to

Him and it is a great hope and encouragement that while nations are seemingly drifting apart the churches are drawing nearer and nearer together.

Another interesting fact about the Conference in general is that it was not legislative. It sought to avoid the apparently impressive but finally ineffective production of resolutions or statements purporting to be the mind of the Conference on the difficult questions under discussion. Rather it spent its energy in the realization of the Community to which, as Christian Youth, the members already belonged. As a preparatory letter to delegates put it, "The great things which we should expect from Amsterdam may not be very great in the eyes of the world, for we shall not be able to offer ready-made solutions for the world's ills, and we shall not be able to draw up programmes of action which tell everybody exactly what to do. But they may be great according to a different and deeper standard. A sense of the indestructible bond by which Christians are united, an understanding of our own small task in the light of the Church of Christ in the world, new insights derived from the intimate contact with fellow-Christians, and above all a new courage based on the knowledge that God is really at work in the world—these are not small things; in fact, they are the things that count in the long perspective of God's kingdom".

One other way in which Amsterdam made a new contribution to the Oecumenical Movement was in its experiments regarding worship, and I am certain that the morning hours of worship will be amongst the most abiding memories of the Conference. The central idea was that the delegates represented various Church traditions and not merely a variety of private religious experience, confessions as diverse as Lutherans and Baptists, Quakers and Orthodox, Reformed and Anglican, so that if you want to come to a real understanding of the Churches you must see them at their most typical, that is in their forms of corporate worship. Accordingly those who conducted worship in the Concertgebouw each day were asked to do so as representatives of the tradition from which they came. Some of the most interesting documents we have brought home are the little grey booklets in which the form of worship for each day was set down in three languages. These little booklets will remind us of experiences we shall not forget, the restrained spontaneity of the English Free Church service, the severe dignity of the Calvinist approach, the Lutheran where we sat to sing and pray and stood while God's Word was read, the African Negro with its moving solo, calling to worship, in the words of an old African prophet against a background of palms—"ding, dong, ding, dong, come, ye are called to heaven"—the Indian Anglican, and the American service where the matter-of-factness we usually associate with the States was beautifully blended with the wistful, plaintive approach of the slave's spirituals.

But the greatest difficulty and the highest achievement was in connection with the services of Holy Communion. There we were up against the hardest fact of all, that at the very central point of Christian unity we were divided. There are various ways of facing this situation. One is not to draw much attention to it, to have our separate Communion services, and to ignore as much as possible the fact that several services are being held, but to emphasize our unity in some special conference service, which is not a service of Holy Communion and does not raise awkward questions. Another way is to ignore what is a numerical minority, and by leaving them out, to achieve a feeling of unity amongst the majority who are at liberty to partake of Communion together. That would be quite easy to do in a conference like ours, in which the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Church are a comparatively small section numerically. But the organizers of the

Conference felt that either of these ways was not only untrue to the facts of our tragic situation as Christians, but would also waste a great opportunity for learning something new. The plan was to arrange for each of the four main liturgical traditions present to hold their own services and to invite the whole Conference to share in each so far as was allowed by the church discipline of each of these Communions and of each Conference delegate. The plan was a very hard one for many people to understand, and was an occasion for real penitence for those who understood it best.

The service of preparation for Holy Communion, held for the whole Conference on the Saturday night, was the one thing which made the experiment possible. Robert Mackie, the general secretary of the W.S.C.F., helped us to see the strange paradox of the whole thing, that while this necessity for separate services must be a reason, not for irritation, but for deep penitence, there is also to be found in it the real basis of our hope. For whoever stays away from the service, Jesus Christ is always there. At every celebration of the Lord's Supper, He, not the Church, is the Host, and He calls us to strive anew for the coming of the day when His Supper is no longer celebrated in a divided family.

Consequently, Sunday was a busy day. The Anglican Eucharist was celebrated in the Remonstrantsche Kerk at 8.30 a.m., and ministers from England, America, Japan, and India took part. In the Nieuwe Kerk at 10.30 the main service was held and a sermon preached by Dr. Kraemer, the famous Dutch missionary writer. The way in which the Holy Supper of Jesus Christ was celebrated impressed me very much, and I thought we might introduce it on occasion in our churches. Long tables spread with white cloths were set in the middle of the nave. Communicants sat round them and the wine was poured into the one cup and the bread broken from the one loaf, before our eyes, and we passed the elements to each other, while the officiating minister read verses of scripture. As we went to the table we made our offering. In the evening the Danish High Mass was celebrated in the Lutheran Church. The vestments, the lights, the hymns of Martin Luther (sung sitting), and the moving practice of individual absolution at the altar steps, gave to those non-Lutherans present a new and vivid understanding of the richness of the Lutheran tradition.

Then on the Monday morning came what must have been for many the newest and strangest experience of all, the celebration on the platform of the Concert Hall of the Holy Liturgy of the Orthodox Church. The altar with its cross of flowers, the candles and ikons, the priests in many-hued vestments, the kissings and crossings, the haunting singing of the Russian choir, now soft and plaintive, now rising to exultant thanksgiving, the wafted fragrance of incense, above all, an atmosphere of mystic devotion and adoration, which not even the unfamiliar setting of a concert hall could destroy, all gave an insight, otherwise unachievable, into the very soul of the Orthodox Church. I have dwelt at length on the worship side of the Conference because it was a new development. Through joining in the different traditions I began to realize that, although much of our division in the Church is due to human sinfulness, many differences arise from the inadequacy of any one human view of the glory of God's revelation. I also realized that there is much we can do together without necessarily worshipping in the same way; unity is not synonymous with uniformity. The one "dogma" which bound us together was the Conference motto, *Christus Victor.*

I will not dwell on the other plenary sessions of the Conference, one or two of which were held each day, and the addresses given, even though they were delivered by such eminent speakers as the Archbishop of York, Drs.

Reinhold Niebuhr, T. Z. Koo, John R. Mott, and George Macleod (the themes were thrillingly entitled, "The Christian in a World of Conflict", "Can men be brothers?", "The Christian Community and the World of Nations", *etc.*), for they were the least effective part of Amsterdam. I must except Pasteur Lauriol's mighty effort on "Our Daily Bread", which was the only speech to evoke spontaneous applause.

The Conference was divided into forty-three discussion groups. In the mornings these studied passages from the Scriptures, every group doing the same study, related to the theme of the day, *e.g.*, "Not by bread alone", "Witnesses unto Me", "Members of one body". This study together gave us the right emphasis with which to deal with the afternoon topics of group discussion. The contribution of the Continentals in these morning sessions was most helpful and salutary to some of us English and Americans. After tea the same groups then discussed throughout the ten days of the Conference one subject from the following: Christian Youth and the World of Nations, in Nation and State, and Education, and Race, in the Economic Order, Christian Marriage and Family Life, The Church, its nature and mission. Here is a typical group: a Chinese teacher, an English banker, a French nurse, a Scottish textile worker, a Swiss librarian, a Latvian university lecturer, a Japanese student, an Irish solicitor, a Dutch publisher, an Indian social worker, an American telephone operator, a Hungarian lawyer, an African pastor, a Swedish accountant, and a dozen others sit down before the familiar parable of the Prodigal Son, and in the face of problems of Christian Youth in the economic order. Barriers of language, colour, and position were broken like paper hoops, but there was a difficulty in reaching an understanding on the exact meaning of certain words and concepts which often varied according to the country, and in grasping other people's doctrinal difficulties. Group discussions have been described as occasions when people who know nothing about a subject gather together to pool their ignorance and become more ignorant still because each adds to his own ignorance that of everyone else! The Conference Committee guarded against this by supplying experts in each section who moved from group to group. On the whole the groups were successful. As people became acquainted they spoke more frankly, and although we naturally did not agree on everything, we learned about, and respected, each other's opinions.

At the beginning of the Conference, especially at the first session when the seventy-one nations rose in turn as each country's name was called to the applause of the rest, there seemed a great unity, but it was partly artificial and largely emotional, stimulated by the flags and the dresses and the drama of the occasion. As the Conference progressed and we became better acquainted, one realized how bewilderingly diverse we all were. No longer will some measure of understanding and unity seem an easy thing to create, for within our astonishing diversity it was difficult to distinguish the eternally valid from the historically conditioned. The Rev. Oliver Tomkins puts it clearly when he says:

> It might be said that the laws of this country of Oecumenism are determined by two equal and apparently opposite rules, the rule of love and the rule of truth. The attempt to obey both these rules at once really explains all the difficulties as well as the achievements and joys of this country. The rule of love demands unity. It was the prayer of Our Lord "that they may all be one", and His prayers are our laws. Love of Him draws us inevitably towards Him, and in Him to one another. The rule of truth imposes division. It is just because the truth of God is so much greater than the apprehension of it which any

> human tradition (even under the guidance of the Holy Spirit) can *fully* express that adherence to truth divides us from our fellows. It is because it is *God's* truth which we believe we have been shown that we cannot lightly abandon it, as we may abandon our opinions. We may only abandon it, not when someone else convinces us that *they* are right, but when *God* has shown us something to which we must consent.

Towards the end of the Conference I felt a community deeper than the emotional unity of the opening session, I knew in my bones what it meant to live in a world of nations and races, a discovery that makes me sad because of its problems and joyful because of the enrichment it has brought to my life.

At Amsterdam I, personally, discovered three things—the world with all its magnificent bewildering variety, *the* Church that knows only one creed, *Christus Victor,* and the relevance of the Word of God to our times and troubles.

On the last day the chairman of the Conference made a statement drawn up on the basis of many conversations with delegates and leaders, and I can think of no better way of ending this article than by quoting its concluding paragraph:

> As we now return to our different lands and to our different callings within the one Church of Christ, we do so with the conviction that the adventure of co-operation and fellowship which we have been led to must be faithfully carried on. This world gathering marks the beginning of an ever-widening task—we face this task realizing that in Christ is our strength. "The people who do know their God shall be strong and do exploits."

THE THIRTEENTH CONGREGATIONAL THEOLOGICAL CONFERENCE, 1939.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Never can the annual Theological Conference of Congregationalists have had a more pleasant setting for its meetings than it had this year at St. Hugh's College, Oxford, during the first week in July. It was a pity that neither the Chairman, the Rev. Norman Goodall, nor the Vice-Chairman, Principal R. S. Franks, was able to be there, the former being in the South Seas, whilst the latter was unfortunately kept away by illness. But it was a happy and fitting thing that the ex-Principal of Mansfield, Dr. Selbie, should welcome the Conference to Oxford, and preside over its sessions. We were glad to see him looking so well, and to find him as able as ever to talk simply and straightly about his faith. Some welcome contributions to the discussions were made by Dr. Vernon Bartlet. The appreciated presence of Dr. H. D. A. Major was a reminder of the sympathetic interest taken in the Conferences by Modernist leaders in the Church of England.

The general subject under consideration was "The Person of Jesus Christ". On so central a theme, deeper differences of thought were bound to be expressed than could be reconciled in four days; nevertheless it was more than useful to have certain issues made clear, and a number of misunderstandings removed, in the course of formal and informal debates

innocent of *odium theologicum*. The unity of the Spirit was expressed and fostered in the morning devotions most helpfully led by the Rev. John Bevan, and in the quiet Communion Service in Mansfield College Chapel.

In his able and original opening paper on "The Historical Jesus", Professor Lee Woolf sought to lay the factual foundation of any theological construction. He urged us to recognize not only that the Gospels were coloured by first-century modes of thought, but also that Jesus Himself must be understood in close connexion with His own age and nation. Dr. Woolf exposed the inadequacy of the extreme interpretations of both the Liberal and Eschatological schools, and warned us against the too dogmatic use of Scripture in formulating a Christology. While there is truth in the "numinous" interpretation of Christ, we need the complementary study of the "ethical Jesus", who made ethics live, as the core of religion, in His redemptive concern for humanity. The history of the Person who dominates the Gospel records is conveyed to us in His words, acts, and attitudes. He was unique as an incomparable religious force, whose influence on man provides the datum of Christian experience. While there is evidence in the Gospels for what Jesus said and thought and felt about Himself, His character and personality are ultimately mysteries, needing for even their partial understanding the responsiveness of the believer.

Dr. C. H. Dodd, in a brilliant lecture on "The Apostolic Faith", said that the most primitive apostolic preaching began with the word "fulfilment", a word central to all our thinking about the Person of Christ. In attempting to convert Gentiles, the Jew was wont to recite the "mighty acts of God" in his nation's history; but the Christian, seeing in Jesus Christ the fulfilment of the historical process in Israel, recited the "mighty acts of God" in Christ. The theology of the Early Church was based, not on the words and deeds of Jesus, or on His self-consciousness, but fundamentally on what God had wrought in Christ. "Fulfilment" indicates that the Incarnation cannot be thought of as suddenly beginning at Christ's birth: it began with the call of Abraham. The Old Testament expectations are realized in the New. The Church as the true Israel of God is the fulfilment of that which the old Israel was moving towards. For Paul, Israel is its true self as it is embodied in Christ, in whom all things are to be summed up. "Fulfilment" implies achievement, and because of the victory Christ won men recognized Him as the Lord of history, able to control the principalities and powers which rule this present world. This was to ascribe divine honours to Jesus—which immediately raised the question of His status in a religion that from the beginning had been monotheistic. The first provisional answer was that the acts of Christ were the acts of God.

In speaking about "The Christ of the Creeds" Principal N. Micklem had a congenial task, and he stoutly defended the Christology of the early centuries as true to the substance of the Gospels. Because of Jesus Christ, Christians have entered into a new relationship with God. Inevitably we try to define the status of Him who inaugurated this new relationship, and in so doing we must conform to a double test: first, any formulation must preserve the divine-human Figure of the Gospels; and second, it must be true to the experience of redemption in the Church. We were reminded that the two special problems of formulation dealt with in the creeds are the unity of the Godhead (how can there be but one God if we ascribe divine titles to Jesus?), and the unity of Christ's own nature (how can one Being properly be described as both the Carpenter of Nazareth and the Son of the living God?). Dr. Micklem showed that in their attempts to answer these questions the rejected heresies had failed to satisfy one or both of the stated tests; while the creeds were content to affirm, in the Nicean formula,

that in Christ we apprehend both God and man; and in the Chalcedonian definition, that in Christ was both divine and human, without change, division, or separation. It was a process of negative rejection which led up to the Conciliar definitions, so that the early heresies might be regarded as ways of thought labelled "blind alleys", and the historic creeds as embodying those essential elements in the "mystery" of Christ's Person which any future formulation must preserve.

Outstanding in the Conference, by general consent, was the finely evangelical paper by Principal Lovell Cocks on "Re-interpretation of the Fact of Christ". We were not redeemed, he said, unless the Creator had redeemed us, and yet redemption had come through Jesus Christ. Not only did He share the uniqueness of us men as individuals, and all the uniqueness which belongs to men of genius, but also He was Himself uniquely a genius, for while philosophers and poets have raised great questions without successfully answering them, Jesus has the final answer to the deep question posed by our entire existence as men. We cannot separate what He said from what He did and what He was. "He is Himself the Word He speaks, which is not the utterance of our human aspirations but the good news of God's grace". We must recognize not only His likeness to us but also His unlikeness, for "His is an absolute, ours a mediated sonship". If we speak of man as divine, we betray an insufficiently realistic view of sin, and indicate our belief that God and man are not as separate as the creeds affirm. This is not to be dismissed as too gloomy a view of man, for it is a judgment which Christ Himself makes us pass, in virtue of His uniquely reconciling deed. Jesus reveals God: He also reveals man, for He is *the* Man as well as *a* man, "the Son as man", God seen in the conditions of our own life. Jesus Christ, in His office of Mediator, is the revelation of God's power to call us into sonship. Mediation is possible because man's isolation is only an appearance due to sin, which, although it distorts, cannot destroy, our proper relation to God, into which Christ restores us.

Papers entitled "Towards a Christology" were read by Dr. A. T. Cadoux and Professor H. Cunliffe-Jones. In his closely-knit argument Dr. Cadoux, after stressing the importance of the Synoptic record of Christ's uniqueness and finality, examined (as Principal Cocks had done) the notion of uniqueness. He concluded that Jesus is significantly unique, not as the result of an intrusion from without, but within the order of humanity, as "the full answer and accord of man, in whom God is, to God in whom man has his being". Such uniqueness involves uniqueness of position (a certain point in history), which again involves finality. This unique position occurs at the point where religion either progresses from a national to a universal faith, or becomes decadent and retrogressive. Jesus, living in such a crisis of religion—the great turning-point of history—was perfectly adequate to it, and by His work enables us to enter into and share His heritage. His full answer to God inevitably made Him the Redeemer, in whom the creative divine immanence found complete fellowship with the divine transcendence, thus making possible God's creative activity in redeeming and recreating mankind.

What much theological reconstruction took for its basis was challenged by Professor Cunliffe-Jones, who earnestly claimed that the real foundation of Christology is the simple Christian intuition that "Jesus Christ is our divine-human Saviour who is central for our religious life". He alone is adequate to meet our human need to know God as the Saviour from sin, able to set us free from the power of this world. Ultimately the acceptance of this intuition raises the practical question: Is Jesus Christ an object of

faith in our devotional life? Only the faith which answers "yes" to that question, and rests upon the fundamental Christian intuition, is adequate, for it alone is true to the New Testament and to the age-long witness of the Church. Such a faith is not a function of our own "inner light" but is due to the inner witness of the Holy Spirit: it is a gift. Christologies which claim that complete immanence or moral perfection is equivalent to divinity are not really stating this central New Testament Faith. We must begin, rather than end, with our "divine-human Saviour"; else we shall not have Him at all.

On the last morning of the Conference, the Rev. John Marsh summed up the thought and discussion of the previous days. He said that one important misunderstanding had been removed: there had been objection to the view that the Incarnation was an "intrusion" from another realm, but those expounding that belief had, with Dr. Dodd, claimed that the Incarnation was no sudden, unconnected irruption, but had begun with God's earliest dealings with His people, and was the fulfilment of their history. There had been general agreement that the question of the Person of Christ could not ultimately be separated from that of His Work. Considerable differences of opinion had been in evidence as to the basis of Christ's proclaimed divinity. According to one view, it was proclaimed because of what God had wrought in Him; whilst another type of theology regarded this as non-moral, and sought a rectification by making the supreme ethical quality of Christ's life the basis of His divinity. It did not seem that the two views even here were ultimately irreconcilable, but there did seem to be a difference of conviction between their protagonists as to the right starting-point. For the one side, Christ's divinity was something given, with which the theologian therefore began, as the experienced material and basis of all explanation. For the other side, His divinity was itself an interpretation of the given, to which it stood related as the explanation of man's experience of Christ. This appeared to be a deep-rooted and a religious difference, but during the Conference either side had strenuously, and not altogether unsuccessfully, attempted to find common ground, by offering the other a formula which might prove acceptable to both.

It should be added that Mr. Marsh was elected Secretary of the Conferences in succession to the Rev. B. C. Plowright, who deserves our deep appreciation and gratitude for his efficient and unstinted service during the last seven years. He was cordially elected our Vice-chairman, with the Rev. Norman Goodall as Chairman, Mrs. Horton as Treasurer, and the Rev. W. B. J. Martin as Assistant Secretary.

H. I. Frith and John Marsh.

What Gladstone was to Britain, Dadabhai Naoroji was to India, the G.O.M., and in days when the relationship of the two countries is of the utmost importance to both—and to the world—it is well that Mr. R. P. Masani should have given us a biography. True, he has given us too much of a good thing, for the 550 pages of *Dadabhai Naoroji* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) could have been shortened with advantage, and a critical reading of the typescript would have eliminated errors like "Sir *William* Lawson". Dadabhai, who lived from 1825 to 1917, was a Parsi, a pioneer of the movement for self-government who believed in reform by constitutional means. He loved both India and Britain, sat in Parliament as a Gladstonian Liberal, and in his extreme old age called India to the support of Britain in the War. Here his long life is described in detail by a wholehearted admirer.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.*)

C. F. G. Masterman. By LUCY MASTERMAN. Nicholson & Watson. 18s.

Not So Humdrum. By R. W. HARRIS. Lane. 8s. 6d.

Mrs. Masterman's life of "the vivid tormented man I loved" is so good that it is a pity someone—friend or publisher's reader—has not helped her to make it better. There are innumerable slips such as "Mesopotamia" for "Macedonia", "Cabben" for "Cubbon"; apostrophes are frequently wrongly placed or missing altogether—Well's, St. Marks, Rollins, Brahm's Kings Weigh House; there are misspellings that are not Masterman's, sentences which convey no meaning, and often episodes without endings. And yet with all these blemishes the book is successful as a biography, for it makes its subject live. Masterman's intimacy with men in the forefront of politics and journalism makes his *Life* of peculiar importance, and the fact that many extracts from diaries are incorporated makes it all the more valuable. We have Balfour in 1903 asking Mrs. Sidney Webb, "What exactly is a Trades Union?" and declaring, "I have so much enjoyed meeting some clever young men. The young men of my own party are all so uninteresting". Mr. Churchill in 1908 is

> just an extraordinarily gifted boy, with genius and astonishing energy. I always feel of immense age when I am with him—though he's only a year younger than I am. "Sometimes I feel as if I could lift the whole world on my shoulders", he said last night.

Or (1909) after the birth of Winston's daughter:

> "Is she a pretty child?" said George. "The prettiest child I've seen," said Winston beaming. "Like her mother, I suppose?" said George. "No", said Winston, still more gravely, "she is exactly like me".

Masterman worked with Mr. John Burns, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Lloyd George in turn, and his impressions of them all are lively indeed, as are his descriptions of the Liberal Cabinet in the pre-War years. He himself was perhaps at his best in handling the Insurance Bill in the House of Commons, though his association with the Bill proved his nemesis: Mrs. Masterman does not make clear, however, why the Cabinet did not stand by him after his shocking ill-luck at the bye-elections: Asquith did not usually let his lieutenants down, while he did so much to help out Mr. Lloyd George—of whom there are striking glimpses at Criccieth, Brighton, and Downing Street—that surely a safe seat in Wales might have been forthcoming.

Mrs. Masterman has given to us a picture of the political life of the first twenty years of the century that will live. Her husband was called a "splendid failure", and it is interesting to ponder on the comparison of his fate and that of Mr. Churchill, with whom, in the words of A. G. Gardiner, he "ran neck and neck . . . as the man of the future". Probably the explanation is to be found in the ill-health which dogged Masterman con-

tinually, an ill-health which no doubt accounted for his moodiness and bitterness. To quote A. G. Gardiner again, "he carried too much sail of emotion for his mental and physical capacity".

Though it tails off towards the end, Mr. Harris's "Autobiography of a Civil Servant", *Not So Humdrum,* is good reading, just the thing for a railway journey or for an easy chair in the evening. As becomes a contributor to *Punch,* Mr. Harris has a lively pen, but the reader will nevertheless learn much about a Civil Servant's life, and especially about the establishment of National Health Insurance in this country. Well-known figures like Mr. Lloyd George flit through the pages, and the reader will have many a chuckle in a book which is a suitable pendant to Mrs. Masterman's biography.

EDITOR.

The Study of Theology. Edited by KENNETH E. KIRK, BISHOP OF OXFORD. Hodder. 15s.

This collection of essays by distinguished scholars and theologians aims at supplying what used to be known as "Theological Encyclopaedia", *i.e.,* the preliminary review of the whole field to be covered by the student of theology. It claims also to meet the needs of the educated layman who wants to know what Christian theology is, but most of the essays would require a high standard of mental training and even some technical knowledge on the part of such a reader. As usually happens in a symposium of independent writers, the general aim has been differently interpreted. Some of the contributors linger on the threshold of their subject; others tend to an undue degree of specialization along the line of their personal interests, or are rather too "oblique" and allusive. With one exception, all the writers are, or have been, linked to Oxford, and the book has both the virtues and the—limitations, let us say, which that might suggest. Its fine and well-documented scholarship is too exclusively concerned with the patristic, credal, and sacramental side of theology, whilst the Reformation and subsequent theology receive, on the whole, less attention than many will think they deserve. But the book is nevertheless a valuable handbook for the student, not least by its usually copious bibliographies.

The long (82 pp.) opening essay by Dr. N. P. Williams is a masterly review of the whole field of historical and systematic theology. He obviously tries to be scrupulously fair to his antitheses—"Liberal Protestantism" and "empiricism"—whilst defending his own allegiance to "Critical Orthodoxy". He considers the production of a modern eschatology to be "one of the greatest needs of present-day religion", whilst dismissing the Barthian attempt to meet this need. Only the professional student will realize how much theological learning lies behind the *obiter dicta* of his smoothly flowing rotundity of style, illumined by frequent gleams of pungent satire.

Prof. E. O. James, writing on "Comparative Religion", gives a useful review of the earlier developments, from Tylor onwards. He is too confident as to the place of New Year Festival ideas in the religion of Israel, and such a volume as this requires an ampler treatment of sacrifice. Father D'Arcy's discussion of the philosophy of religion is difficult to follow and is limited—through the ecclesiastical position of the author—to "natural" as contrasted with "supranatural" theology. His bibliography is a rather curious selection, hardly adequate to the subject. Prof. Grensted's survey of the whole field of the psychology of religion is a valuable one, and its lengthy bibliography will be warmly welcomed by the student. His careful definition of terms is particularly illuminating. Prof. Danby gives a discriminating statement of the value of the Old Testament and of its relation

to archæology. Most readers would have been grateful for greater emphasis on the theological preparation in the Old Testament for the New, but limitations of space are always a difficulty in this kind of work.

Prof. Dodd's admirable essay on the New Testament gives a well-balanced account of the relation of the primary and essential Christian faith to its environment and of the present trends of critical work on the New Testament. The essay on symbolic theology by the late Prof. Goudge gives a patient exposition of the creeds on the level of the more ordinary reader, but does not get very close to the problems which they raise. Principal Micklem's account of the history of doctrine is clear in statement and based on a good selection of essential points. The essay on ecclesiastical history by Prof. Hamilton Thompson is disappointing, chiefly because, as the writer admits, he has largely dwelt on the history of the Church of England, following his own special interest. Beyond this, the work is too slight and superficial to be of much use. The editor's essay on moral theology is of somewhat unusual character and is concerned, as he himself says, with first principles, rather than with those applications of them which his title suggests. He is chiefly interested in the disentanglement of "conscience" from its setting, and defines it suggestively as "the soul listening to the voice of God enunciating moral truths, but often hearing what is said inadequately and imperfectly". The closing essay by Mr. Ratcliff on "Christian Worship and Liturgy" is rich in learning and catholic in spirit. He is fair in his judgment of types of worship other than his own, whilst (naturally enough from his personal standpoint) most of his essay is concerned with the Communion Service. In the judgment of the reviewer, the outstanding essays are those by Dr. Williams, Dr. Grensted, Dr. Dodd, and Mr. Ratcliff.

Altogether, readers will be grateful to editor and contributors for a work of such solid qualities and thorough scholarship. It is a book which every student of theology, elementary or advanced, can read with advantage. Even though we believe that the future reconstruction of theology will run on broader lines than many of the writers would admit, such reconstruction must be built on a foundation of scholarship and conviction not less deep than that of this book—a searching demand.

H. Wheeler Robinson.

The Christian Hymnary for use of the Churches of Christ. The Berean Press.

Many answers have been given to the question, "What constitutes a Hymn?". But it has one characteristic which differentiates it from other religious verse; it is intended to be sung. Most people, when they say that they do not like a hymn book, mean that they do not like the tunes. It is certainly very disturbing to the peace of mind one likes to associate with worship when a beautiful hymn is announced and a tune is played which scarcely anyone knows. In choirs and places where they *don't* sing, it matters less, but when the congregation takes its part in the praises of God, as it always should, nothing so damps the ardour of devotion. It is scarcely less distressing when a great hymn is sung to the wrong tune. The present writer, in a chapel in North Wales where Mr. Lloyd George is wont to worship, and where the hymn book now under review is in use, has recently heard "Jesus shall reign" sung to the tune associated with "At even ere the sun was set", and "Hail to the Lord's anointed" sung to "Aurelia". But whether the Editors of *The Christian Hymnary* are to blame for that we cannot say, because no tunes are given. There is a separate tune book to which reference is made by a number at the head of each hymn, but we have not seen it. The old idea of a "proper" tune for every hymn has

lately been revised, and though it has its disadvantages it does at least save us from the dreadful heresy that any tune of the same metre is suitable for any hymn. But not having seen the tune book we are here only concerned with the selection of words in *The Christian Hymnary*. Let it be said at once that if the tunes are as good as the hymns, it is a very good hymn book indeed. The "Churches of Christ" are not a very large body in this country. They are better known in America. It would be difficult to judge, by a casual glance at these hymns, what denomination had produced this collection: which is as it should be. It is in the true sense a catholic collection, and shows the way to that hymn book for use in all the Free Churches which is so much to be desired. Only when we turn to the section on "Baptism" do we discover that the "Churches of Christ" are akin to the Baptists. No provision is made for infant baptism.

The Christian Hymnary is the work of a Committee appointed in 1932 by the Annual Conference of the Churches of Christ in Great Britain and Ireland. It consists of nearly 800 hymns, selected, we are told, out of 2,000 submitted. It is itself a revision of an earlier book, published in 1908, consisting of over 1,000 hymns of which less than 500 have survived. The Committee rightly draws attention to the excellent Preface which James Wallis wrote in the first Hymn Book for the use of the Churches of Christ in this country, published in 1841. James Wallis protested against the over-subjectivity of a certain type of evangelical hymn. "We have endeavoured", he writes,

> to avoid including hymns the chief object of which is expression of ourselves, or addressed to any of the Christian virtues: feeling confident there is not anything that can be said about our frail selves in the least worthy to be mentioned, in praise to Him who has called "all flesh as grass, and the glory of man as the flower of grass".

The object of Church praise, say the Editors, is not ourselves but God:

> All ancient hymns of the Church testify to the fact that primitive Christians preferred to sing "Glory be to Thee, O God", rather than "O that will be glory for *me*".

They emphasize, too, that Christianity is an historical religion:

> Christian Doctrine consists of facts—the things which have been done by God, are being done by Him, and which He has promised to do. What we are concerned with is the Holy action of God in creation and redemption.

This note is frequently heard among Christian theologians to-day. It makes a sound basis for a hymn book of the Christian Church.

This having been said we should expect to find Isaac Watts well represented. Here are 21 of his finest hymns, including "I'll praise my Maker". The proportion between Watts and Wesley is striking: 21 of Watts and only 23 of Charles Wesley. Most of the classic hymns of the Church are here. But we miss "Blessed City, heavenly Salem", also "And now the wants are told". "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord" is here, with the original last line restored. Among living writers, Elvet Lewis, Charter Piggott, and Edward Shillito are represented. There is a selection of Psalms for chanting, and also Scripture Passages, some of which are not very suitable for singing. *I Cor.* 13 is certainly lyrical, but it was never meant to be chanted. There is no special section for young people, but hymns judged to be suitable for youth are marked with an asterisk. There is a section under "The Gospel" for special missions. This includes some popular hymns of the Mission type, together with such hymns as Cowper's "Hark, my soul", Faber's "Souls of men! why

will ye scatter", and Dix's "Come unto Me". The inclusion of these classic hymns side by side with others of the Sankey and Moody type raises the question whether the best "Mission Hymns" are not to be found among the great hymns of the Church.

K. L. Parry.

THE RELIGION OF OUR CHILDREN

Religion and the Growing Mind. By Basil A. Yeaxlee. Nisbet. 7s. 6d.

Handbook of Christian Teaching, for use with Agreed Syllabuses. Sheldon Press. 4s. 6d.

Scripture Teaching Today. By M. Vivian Hughes. S.C.M. 5s.

Religious Instruction in the Elementary School. By J. R. Lumb. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Robert Raikes, a critical study. By Guy Kendall. Nicholson & Watson. 3s. 6d.

Religion in School, a Study in Method and Outlook. By G. L. Heawood. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The study of the religion of children is one of the major achievements of the twentieth century. Graham Howe and Adler, William Brown and Hadfield, Clavier and Piaget, Crichton Miller, J. R. Rees and many another, have opened up to us new realms of endless suggestion and value. We felt that there was much to explore; today we know that the exploration is going on to an extent that surpasses all our dreams and surmises. The difficulty now is to keep pace with the case-books of the experts. In this one bundle of new books alone there is, for parent and teacher and student alike, God's plenty.

Dr. Yeaxlee's is the most considerable and must have first attention. Starting from the definition that religion is "a correspondence between normal, healthy, human life and God, as the final, living, personal reality", he seeks to reveal the impact made by religion on the mind as it progresses from babyhood to full adolescence. He is not too greatly enamoured of the world-famous psychologists, though he shows intimate knowledge of their work. Honourable exception is made, however, of that classic for all teachers and preachers, Jung's *Modern Man in Search of a Soul.* "Religion", he maintains in his principal thesis,

> is the response of the complete man to what is supreme in his universe. At every stage from birth to maturity our developing propensities and capacities are to our ripening religion as warp to woof.

The analysis by which he traces this through the six distinct stages between childhood and complete adolescence, is a sheer joy to read.

> All the foundation stones of the mental life are laid down during the first three years, at which time a child's brain is already two-thirds of the weight of the adult brain. What it acquires during those earliest years before it can understand or use the simplest words of religion has literally an incalculable influence.

During that period parents are "mediators of reality" (Graham Howe) to their children. Hence the little child's religion depends supremely on "what parents are in themselves and how they behave". "Like the mother, the father must be, for his children, religion in action" (Clavier). After the two earliest stages teachers—not unhappily described as "semi-detached parents"—arrive on the scene. With the parents they help the child to face the many crises preceding and accompanying puberty, when his chief business, as Dr. Arnold used to put it, is "the formation and projection of ideals". With a mind which is "more like a civil war than a personality",

the boy must now face a double adjustment—to the social group of which he is just becoming a part and, particularly, to the gaining of poise and balance within himself. The adolescent's outward indifference to religion is merely a "bluff, a defence mechanism"; within he is ready to welcome any belief which tells him he may live on the high sanctified plane to which he aspires: "The hunger for a satisfactory religion is generally at the root of his disquietude". Dr. Yeaxlee agrees with Mr. Maurice Jacks that "many a public-school boy leaves without a ghost of a notion what he believes, but yet able to say, in the silence of his own solitariness, 'I know *Whom* I believe' ". A great book, to be read and re-read by all students of their kind.

The Handbook of Christian Teaching, to be used with agreed syllabuses, has prefaces by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Scott Lidgett. It contains a vast amount of useful knowledge for the teacher of the Bible, *when he can find it.* But its arrangement is intricate, and it badly needs a "text index". To search for a reference to "manna" and to be brought up suddenly by "Hugh Martin" is characteristic of the mixed-up-ness of the book itself. Thus on three successive pages information (and very good information) is given on the Messianic Hope, the Jews of the Dispersion, and the *Book of Daniel!* The work is sound and admirable and will be of great value to those teachers who master its complexity. But it might easily have been a masterpiece.

In *Scripture Teaching Today* arrangement again militates against success in what should have been a first-class book. Full of good stuff, this is the case-book of an inspector of no ordinary ability; but for the reader who wishes to put it to good use there is no other way than to read it through and to make *en route* a working index. That said, one can give it unstinted praise. If only inspectors of similar resource, erudition (the asides *re* Astruc and Dekker, *e.g.,* are worth a lot) and adaptability could visit all our schools and Sunday Schools, we should have within six months a revival in our entire Bible teaching. And it should be on every minister's shelves too. The questions raised today concerning Jael, Cain, Gehazi, the Ark, the rich young ruler, Job, "enquiring of the Lord", Christ's use of hyperbole, Jonah, the devil, are handled with a freshness and an intuition which compel admiration. Remarks like "Mark's 'straightway' is just the small boy's 'and so' ", or "a parable is a simple story of everyday things in which *the inevitable* happens", linger willy-nilly in the memory; and the end of our Bible teaching, when the boy is face to face with the struggle between principle and worldly advantage, is envisaged: it will not be commandments or dogmas or creeds that will help then, "but a memory of a schoolroom, of a master's face as he announces some startling remark of Jesus, or confesses his ignorance, or expresses his hope".

Religious Instruction in the Elementary School is a most useful book, excellent in all save its title. Canon Lumb addresses it to teachers and clergy in Church or Council Schools, but it should be profitably used by a far wider circle. The ripe understanding and goodness of the writer constantly make themselves felt. Every time we enter the school, we "come as a minister, just as surely as the clergyman entering his church: the Christian teacher is a minister, nothing less". The book is worth its cost for Chapter II alone, "The School at Prayer"; other valuable sections are "The Teacher's Faith" and "The Teacher's Aim". We can only teach the class "out of minds that are growing in the *knowledge* of God and His church". A book of a calibre all too rare.

Mr. Guy Kendall's *Robert Raikes* stands rather aside from the foregoing, but it is delightful to have from the pen of the late Head of Univer-

sity College School this able and fully documented sketch of one who has been the subject of blind, and bland, adulation. This is religious history as it should be written, with a background, a critical faculty, and, above all, proportion. There can be but few biographies which go with such a swing and embrace such a range from the first page to the very end.

For the working teacher of Scripture, who is not afraid of further work, Mr. Heawood's *Religion in School* is a book of books. Of the making of syllabuses, we may feel, there is no end, but when, as here, the Scripture syllabus is regarded merely as a "guide to exploration . . . to be used intelligently and selectively and, whenever necessary, conveniently forgotten"; and when further a most delightfully suggestive multitude of alternative personal syllabuses is given, one can only return thanks. Excursuses on miracles, on creeds, on discipline, and on prayer ("Jesus seems to have prayed more and spoken less about it than all other religious teachers") add to its weight, and two discussions in a Common Room to its humour; we may never have belonged to such Common Rooms, but how charming it would have been to do so. The author believes, with Canon Barry, that "the Christian moral standard is not a code to be defended but . . . an insight to be achieved". "Strong simplicities" should be, he maintains, the food of youth; it would be a great gain if the "simplicities" for which he contends so earnestly were dispensed in every day and boarding school in the country, and if this book were diligently mastered by teachers and ministers alike. One would like to give a couple of pages of quotation illustrating its quality. Let this one suffice: "The important thing" (in religious education) "is what people leave school wanting to make themselves do". A book of rare charm, insight and value.

SYDNEY H. MOORE.

Jesus, a biography. By HUGH J. SCHONFIELD. Duckworth. 8s. 6d.

"For as much as many have taken in hand to draw up" a life of Jesus, though many others assert that the effort is vain, "it seemed good to" Mr. Schonfield also to attempt the task. Disclaiming any theological or propagandist purpose he has availed himself of all the available sources, striven to introduce himself into the circumstances and the mind of Jesus, and even "to live the part as if I had to play it".

In addition therefore to weaving the Synoptic and Johannine strands together (and here perhaps marginal references might have helped the reader), Mr. Schonfield has made use of such ancillaries as a Hebrew *Gospel of Matthew,* the *Gospel of the Hebrews,* the *Toldoth Jeshu,* and several apocryphal and rabbinic writings, together with Josephus. To these specific references are made.

The result is a vivid if florid book, displaying at many points true sensitiveness and spiritual insight. One sample must suffice (from the story of the Baptism—p. 86).

> Slowly he rose up out of the water. A great roaring sound was in his ears, crashing and reverberating. The world seemed to rock on its foundations. What had happened? He did not know whether he was in the flesh or in the spirit. He opened his eyes and as he did so the heavens were rent and a jagged streak of lightning flashed down and lit up the scene with an eerie glare. Again the thunder pealed, and the people gave back terror-stricken. A dove fluttered on to the shoulder of Jesus, stayed a moment, and was gone. Some could have sworn that it entered into him.
>
> John was startled at the strange portent. Shaken by the earthquake, half blinded by the lightning, he peered at the man beside him,

and his dry lips formed the words, "Who art thou, lord?" But there came no answer. Jesus was oblivious of his surroundings. Out of the thunder a voice had spoken to him, a *Bath Qol,* an echo, and it had said: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee". The Spirit of God had descended upon him in the likeness of a dove, and had sung to him this song:

"In the prophets I sought thee,
In thee to rest me.
Thou art my sure rest:
Thou art my eldest,
Reigning for ever."

A mighty joy and a great awe possessed him. His call had come!

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By WILLIAM LEONARD. Burns, Oates. 12s. 6d.

This massive and modestly priced treatise by the Professor of Sacred Scripture in St. Patrick's Seminary, Sydney, is an expansion of the author's original purpose to examine *O.T.* usage in the epistle, which has found fulfilment in the last four of the book's seven chapters. In working up to this he found, as so often happens, that the introductory studies became possessed of an importance all their own; hence chapters on the problem of authorship, the theology of the epistle, and its literary form, which take up more than half the book.

When he set about his task, Dr. Leonard, despite the official pronouncement in 1914 by the Biblical Commission of his Church that *Heb.* is the work of Paul, held Origen's view that while the thoughts are the apostle's, the literary expression and composition belong to another. His investigations have led him to the conclusion that the epistle is Pauline not only in its inner substance, but lock, stock and barrel. He has not only read widely in fields old and new, but brought to his task personal study and long reflection, to say nothing of many a prayer to St. Chrysostom, near whose sarcophagus the book was written.

The epistle, he decides, was written by Paul from Rome between A.D. 63 and 65 to the Judeo-christian community of Jerusalem. Its "organic architecture" presents a development which can only have come from the mind that shaped the theology of the Corinthian and Captivity letters (Dr. Leonard, of course, accepts the whole Pauline *corpus* including the Pastorals). The admitted order, calm, and elegance of the epistle become secondary (Luke may have been the amanuensis) when compared with the phalanx of objective literary facts revealed by a thoroughgoing literary and stylistic analysis. The epistle draws from the same *O.T.* mines that Paul worked elsewhere, and the peculiar formulæ of citations are not out of keeping with the rich formulary of the apostle. Nor do the use of the *LXX* and the details of wording in the citations fix a gulf between *Heb.* and the other Pauline letters. So with the exegesis.

Everything that can be said for the Pauline authorship seems to be said here, but the chief value of this patient and exhaustive study does not lie in the conclusions that are reached (from which most scholars will continue to differ), but in the amount of material that has been collected and arranged. An outstanding example of this is in chapter 3, and in that chapter the pages devoted to the vocabulary of the epistle. It is interesting to note that the book is printed in the Vatican city by the Vatican Polyglot Press, and a very creditable piece of craftsmanship it is. But it is a pity that scholarship should be hampered by the necessity of confirming the findings of authority.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts. By Sir Frederick Kenyon. Milford. 2s.

This reprint of a communication to the British Academy is specifically an examination of the late Prof. A. C. Clark's two volumes on *Acts* published respectively in 1914 and 1933, particularly in the light of evidence derived from the Chester-Beatty and other recently discovered papyri. The elusive and misleading term "Western" is here taken to denote the type of text represented by Codex Bezae, the earliest Old Latin, and the quotations in Cyprian. After providing an illustrative list of passages from the Gospels and *Acts* in which the "Neutral" and the "Western" readings are set out in parallel columns, noting the heterogeneous nature of the "Western", and referring to Blass's theory that Luke himself issued two editions of each of his works, the author comes to grips with Professor Clark. That scholar's first conclusion (based on the frequency of scribal omission in classical MSS. due to *homoioarcton* or *homoioteleuton*) was that the longer text, *i.e.*, the "Western" in *Acts* (albeit the "Neutral" in the Gospels) was the original. In Sir Frederick Kenyon's judgment (fortified by technical knowledge) this contention breaks down; and Clark himself seems to have had some misgivings, for in his second book he shifts his ground from the theory of accidental scribal errors to errors due to deliberate editorial alterations—the excisions are mainly the work of an abbreviator. Here he has a better case, but Sir Frederick while admitting the more attractive character of some of the "Western" readings in *Acts* holds that this is offset "by the questionable company in which they are found". The "Western" must have originated "somewhere where a great diversity of readings existed", and this diversity included both good and bad material. The whole essay must be read to be rightly appreciated, and all who are interested in the fascinating quest of the text of *N.T.* will be grateful to the author for this latest contribution to a study in which he is not only an acknowledged master, but a born expositor.

Alex. J. Grieve.

The Quran. Translated, with a Critical Rearrangement of the Surahs, by Richard Bell, D.D. Vol. II. Clark. 12s. 6d.

The Original Gita, with copious Comments and Notes by Rudolf Otto. E.T. by J. E. Turner. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

In our review in these columns of Vol. I of Dr. Bell's new translation of the *Quran* we pointed out its great importance. It is more than an authoritative translation of the *Quran* by one of the greatest of Islamic scholars. It is an attempt to apply to the *Quran* those principles of Higher Criticism which have done so much to elucidate the Old Testament. We are very grateful for the completion of this work, which will be indispensable to all serious students of the *Quran,* while those who are beginning their study of Islam will do well to use it first. No one knows better than Dr. Bell that his analysis of the *Surahs* is tentative and may be modified by the labours of other scholars, but here, for the first time, is an edition of the *Quran* which makes its teaching intelligible to Western readers.

Dr. Otto's death in 1937 was a grave loss to many departments of scholarship, for his was a mind of amazing versatility. Our first introduction to his writings was his book, *Naturalism and Religion.* Since then has come his much more famous *Das Heilige,* which, in Mr. Harvey's admirable translation, *The Idea of the Holy,* has had much influence on English as on Continental thought. Last year there was published the English translation of his important contribution to New Testament studies,

The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. But Dr. Otto was also a close student of Indian religions. Of his many books in this subject only one has so far appeared in English, his suggestive little book, *India's Religion of Grace.* We warmly welcome Dr. Turner's translation of *The Original Gita,* in which Dr. Otto seeks to distinguish the *Original Gita* from its later accretions, and, in that way, to characterize the teaching of its various strata.

No Western student of the *Gita* can fail to observe the inconsistencies of its teaching. It proclaims a new way of salvation by *bhakti* directed to a God of love, and at the same time identifies this personal God with the impersonal Brahman—Atman of the *Upanishads* who, being devoid of all attributes and activity, can neither know nor be known, love nor be loved.

To any student of the *Gita,* Dr. Otto's attempt to distinguish the various strata inevitably recalls to mind the analysis of the poem given by Dr. Garbe in his *Die Bhagavadgita,* first published in 1905, and Dr. Otto dedicates his book to Dr. Garbe's memory. Garbe regarded the *Gita* as an interpolation into the *Mahabharata* and held that it was originally a theistic poem, the product of Krishnavite devotion, which later was interpolated in the interests of the *Vedanta* teaching. Otto, on the other hand, held that the original *Gita* "was in no sense whatever specifically doctrinal writ" but "simply a fragment of most magnificent epic narrative." It was "into this old and primitive fragment of the Epic itself, as the matrix, that doctrinal writ subsequently became inserted, with the view of securing for it the authority of Krishna's divine Form." Differing from Garbe as to the original *Gita,* Otto agrees "in the majority of cases" "with Garbe's selection of later interpolations and speculation about Brahman".

The writer of this review read Garbe's book whilst studying Hinduism in India and was captivated by its analysis, for it seemed to explain the contradictions of the *Gita* and to make intelligible the early history of the *bhakti* cult. He adopted Garbe's view in the first draft of his book, *Redemption Hindu and Christian,* but felt compelled to abandon it before that book was published through the arguments presented to him by the editor of the series in which it appeared, Dr. J. N. Farquhar, who knew Hinduism not only from books but from long residence in India. His subsequent study of Indian religion has convinced the reviewer that in Indian thought the Law of Excluded Middle does not apply, and that contradictions in teaching do not prove diversity of authorship. We believe that Dr. Hill is right when, in the introduction to his recent edition of the *Gita,* he speaks of it as an "uncompromising eirenicon"; the variety of its views is of the essence of the book.

Although we are thus unable to accept Otto's analysis, which seems to us to rest on assumptions irrelevant to the discussion of this great Indian classic, we are very grateful for his full exposition of the various elements of the *Gita's* teaching. Dr. Otto touched nothing which he did not adorn, and this very learned book is a notable contribution to the study of the *Bhagavadgita* which has to-day in India an influence greater than that of any other book unless it be the Christian Gospels.

SYDNEY CAVE.

Hinduism or Christianity?: A study in the distinctiveness of the Christian Message. By SYDNEY CAVE. Hodder. 6s.

Dr. Cave's new book consists of the Haskell Lectures given at Oberlin College, Ohio, early in the present year. The lectures include, first, an introduction in which the general problems contained in the relationship of Hinduism and Christianity are discussed. There are then chapters on

karma and eternal life; the conception of the Divine in Hinduism and Christianity; *bhakti* and Christian faith; Hindu and Christian ethics; and a final chapter on Hinduism, Christianity and the Gospel.

It can be said without any reserve that no better book can be recommended to those who want a treatment of the subject at the same time scholarly, sympathetic, and Christian. The first and last chapters contain a perfectly balanced discussion of the general relationship of a missionary Christianity to the Hindu religion. Dr. Cave has succeeded in a quite unusual degree in uniting profound sympathy, real scholarship, and a realistic understanding of Christian revelation. His views coincide almost completely with those of Prof. Heinrich Frick of Marburg, in his little book, *The Gospel, Christianity and Other Faiths.*

It is to be hoped that this book will be read not only by those interested in Eastern religions. It has much to say to those who want to understand what Christianity is. Dr. Cave has clearly himself found his own Christianity deepened as he has sought to answer the questions, not only philosophical and theological but religious, posed by his Hindu friends, and this experimental note is not the least valuable element in an extremely valuable book.

W. Paton.

God of the Living, or Human Destiny. By R. H. L. Slater. Nicholson & Watson. 8s. 6d.

Mr. Slater is a Cambridge man now working in Burmah. He was recently Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Rangoon, and if his lectures were at all like the chapters in his book, the students of that University are to be congratulated. The book, as the title would indicate, is really a survey of the whole theological field, and that from a definitely modern standpoint. Mr. Slater says "the religious teacher of the future, if he wishes to carry conviction, must get inside the mind of the scientific student and share his outlook". With this warning in mind, he approaches the questions of God, Man, and their relations, and has something fresh and stimulating to say about them all.

It is impossible within the limits of a review to deal with all the subjects which Mr. Slater raises, but two or three outstanding points in his work may be mentioned. Mr. Slater insists on the Trinitarian conception of deity. He argues that we need

> a distinctive Christian philosophy, based on a recognition of the facts emphasised in Christian experience and a clear recognition of the conceptions essential to the Christian outlook.

For this the Trinitarian idea of deity is essential. It is based on and arises out of the Christian conviction that God is Love, and it is because He is love that God is the living God who, in the words of Eckhart, "can as little do without us as we without Him". This idea of God again involves a high conception of human personality, and one which involves an eternal progress for mankind. Mr. Slater strongly believes in immortality, but it is a conditional immortality; as he says,

> amongst Christian thinkers the old belief that every human being is inherently immortal is yielding ground to a conditional immortality, a belief that eternal life is only realized both here and hereafter if certain conditions are observed.

This conclusion must be read in terms of Mr. Slater's treatment of personality and of the idea of progress, as well as of time and eternity. This, again, leads him to discuss the meaning of history and the relation between philosophy and religion. It is all very interesting and full of suggestion.

Enough, perhaps, has been said to show that Mr. Slater's book is in the best tradition of Anglican theology. It is sober, scholarly, and devout, and withal is written in a style so lively and interesting that he who runs may read.

W. B. Selbie.

Death is not Enough. By Michael Fraenkel. Daniel. 7s. 6d.

The author of these "essays in Active Negation" is an American, an artist, and in some sense a revolutionary. He believes that modern civilization in its mass standardization and its destruction of individuality means spiritual death. What we call progress is a steady decline towards the grave. In the grip of the conventional and the traditional, man has been turned into a mere function; he has ceased to be an end in himself and has been transformed into a mere means for the realization of political and economic ends. Hence he has ceased to live in any effective sense, and all his achievements, such as they are, are redolent with the odour of decay.

It was the experience of 1917-18, as a soldier in the trenches with millions of others, that revealed to Mr. Fraenkel the utter futility of a civilization in which life is being crushed to death under the weight of its vast organization. He saw that the old world was doomed and that a new age calls for a resolute recognition of the fact of spiritual death as furnishing the challenge and the opportunity for a resurrection to newness of life. Active Negation means the repudiation of a dead world together with the creative realization of new spiritual values upon a deeper and more spiritual plane of livingness. The old world with its beliefs, its ideals, its sentiments, and its emotions has utterly collapsed, and the revolutionary action that is called for today consists, first, "in the complete and absolute negation of the present order with all that it stands for in a moribund art, economics, politics, religion, *etc.*", and, secondly, in "a new vision, a new courage, a new affirmation—a primary revolution of faith". It is this creative reaction to our sense of futility that is meant by "Active Negation". It is out of the negation of the old that a new world is born.

No doubt there is much here that is true. Nevertheless, the Bergsonian repudiation of intellect as the way of death, and the enthronement of instinct as the essence of life, seems to demand a regression in human nature that is to carry us back to the purely animal level. Mr. Fraenkel's book is not easy to read, nor his ideas easy to grasp. As a poet he has his own language and symbols. Most readers will find it easiest to begin with the essay on "The Otherness of D. H. Lawrence", in which the author's ideas find their most clear expression. The essay is an illuminating and discriminating interpretation of one of the most enigmatic figures in modern literature. According to Mr. Fraenkel, "Lawrence's contribution to our time is his penetrating analysis and portrayal of the spiritual death of modern man and modern society". For him, intellectualism is the enemy. He would replace the dry rot of thought by the livingness of instinct and intuition. He believes that Science and Reason, so far from bringing the individual into a deeper and fuller consciousness of himself as an integral living part of a vital human society have devitalized and dehumanized him. He therefore turns his back upon all cultural processes and would have us rediscover our spiritual being in the biological life principle which finds expression in sex and in the power urge toward an ever greater fulfilment of the individual life-pattern. Hence we reach a Nietzschian cult of the powerful, and a hatred of all democratic equalitarianism. The aristocrat must rule.

This, however, is not to be taken as justifying Fascism, still less Communism, since both exaggerate man's slavery to the system. Dictator-

ships are symptom perversions of the repressed power instinct. On the social political plane they are what neurosis is on the sexual plane. In the essay, "Beyond the Bread principle", Mr. Fraenkel disposes of Marxian Communism and its root-concept of historical determinism. He argues that history is not some all-mighty Power standing outside man, and shaping his destiny, but that it is the reflection in the physical and tangible world of all that man has thought, felt and done. "Man's destiny is from within; it shapes and determines history. History does not make man; man makes history".

In another essay Mr. Fraenkel discusses the meaning of modern poetry. His view is that poetry dies the moment it is intellectualized as a medium for conveying ideas and meaning. Its proper sphere is the primitive and the emotional. It is "life, not thought; feeling, not cold, barren idea; instinct, not intellect". Poetry, and indeed all art, must return to the vitality of feeling in order to express and transmute emotion. So long as words convey emotion, the intellectual demand for meaning is irrelevant.

These essays contain much that is thought-provoking. They will not satisfy the mind of a Christian, for whom the world is dead in quite a different sense from that which is significant for Mr. Fraenkel, and can be revivified, not by a return to primitive instinct, but only by a return to God. Nevertheless, the book is worthy of careful study on the part of those who wish to come to closer grips with some significant tendencies of our time.

It is a pity that a book so attractively printed should be disfigured by so many misprints. We have noted examples on pp. 61 (footnote), 68, 77, 79, 94 (twice), 96, 147, and 165.

E. J. Price.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)*

The Lutterworth Press has published an attractive and appropriate *Tyndale Commemoration Volume* (7s. 6d.), which reproduces "substantial parts" of Tyndale's Revised Testament of 1534, with some of the original woodcuts. The Rev. R. Mercer Wilson is the Editor, and essays are added by Mr. J. F. Mozley ("The Life of Tyndale") and the Rev. J. R. Coates ("Tyndale's Influence on English Literature").

Awaiting in suspense the news on the morning of September 1st, we found solace and comfort in Miss Jane T. Stoddard's *The Psalms for Every Day* (Hodder, 10s. 6d.). It is incredible that it is 26 years since Miss Stoddart compiled *The Old Testament in Life and Literature,* about a third of which was given to the Psalms. Here she follows the *Prayer Book* arrangement of the Psalms, grouping the psalms for morning and evening under each day. Miss Stoddart has a range of reading few can equal, and from the literature of the world down even to the present she has drawn illuminating comment on passage after passage. We can quote only one, Milton's words attached to *Ps.* 83—

> To every good and peaceable man it must be a hateful thing to be a displeaser and molester of thousands; much better would it like him, doubtless, to be a messenger of gladness and contentment . . . But when God commands to take the trumpet and blow a dolorous and jarring blast, it lies not in a man's will what he shall say, or what he shall conceal.

This is a book to which ministers should turn when preaching on the Psalms; it is even more a book into which one can dip constantly, and always with profit and pleasure.

Admirers of the Rev. Conrad Noel's *Life of Jesus* will be greatly disappointed by his new book, *Jesus the Heretic* (Dent, 5s.), which is about all and sundry—pietism and socialism, Purgatory and pacifism, hell and reunion—but not much about "Jesus the Heretic", the title of one of the twenty-one essays, some of them of considerable interest. Mr. Noel's viewpoint as a Catholic-Socialist is well-known, and its limitations are obvious; when he discusses "Absorption or Reunion?" it is with the Roman and Anglican Churches that he is wholly concerned.

In **What Can we Believe?* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) Mr. Laurence Housman prints letters exchanged with that attractive spirit, Dick Sheppard. The book gains in that only one or two of the letters were intended for publication. All who are interested in the condition of organized religion to-day should read this correspondence between a divine who with difficulty stayed within the bounds of the Church and a critic who, having left the Church, desired a mixture of Quakerism and Catholicism. Dick Sheppard frequently protested he had no brains, and he was certainly no theologian, but he won men by being a "living epistle". Mr. Housman has a pretty wit and an acute mind: his view of the Bible is one that commends itself to us, but one that does not yet seem to have dawned on the traditionalists.

Miss Rosalind Murray's **The Good Pagan's Failure* (Longmans, 7s. 6d.) is an important book, though some will question its taste. Miss Murray, who has become a Roman Catholic, is a daughter of Prof. Gilbert Murray, and her father is the "good pagan" *par excellence* (in our own pages he was recently described as the supreme example of the *kalos kagathos* in Britain). Recognizing to the full the merits of liberal, rationalist "enlightenment", Miss Murray nevertheless is confident that the civilization it has produced has entirely failed; to her, Christianity is totalitarian, and cannot compromise with anything other or less. She continually stresses the antitheses Saint and Good Pagan, Personal Holiness and Social Usefulness, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you" and "Know thyself", Supernatural and Rational. In our own day

> we see the League of Nations, however high its purpose and ideals, to have been founded on a false foundation, a scab upon a wound that was not healed; no admission of sin preceded its foundation, no radical change of heart in those who made it, the victorious powers in a victorious war.

On the whole Miss Murray has the right of it, although she almost spoils her case by overstatement; the antitheses above are not necessarily sound, and to take as typical of the age of faith and the age of reason St. Bernard and "The World's Little Sweetheart" (Mary Pickford) borders on the absurd. Nevertheless the burden of Miss Murray's message is one that the world and the Church need to hear to-day: for the Church needs the good pagan almost as much as the good pagan needs the Church.

In *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day* (Hodder, 2s.), an address to the Swiss Churches, Dr. Karl Barth, the background of whose argument is not easy to focus, urges that silence in face of the totalitarian claims of the State is impossible for the Church.

> The unity of the Church will only be made secure by our speaking out in faith, from this side and that, just as long as we can still speak with one another.

It will be long before the Churches and their members have digested the findings of the Tambaram Conference. They would do well to begin with the Report, *The World Mission of the Church* (Edinburgh House, 1s. 6d.), and then, impelled by the part played by the younger Churches in the Conference, they will probably decide to read Mr. J. Merle Davis's important survey, *The Economic and Social Environment of the Younger Churches* (Edinburgh House, 2s. 6d.). The two volumes together would furnish a worth-while course of study for ministers' fraternals or missionary groups.

Inspired by the Madras Conference, Mr. Basil Mathew's **Through Tragedy to Triumph* (Livingstone Press, 2s.) tells of the tremendous challenge the modern world presents to the Church—and the tremendous opportunity. He sees a world with "martyrdom useless", with civilization breaking down old traditions, with millions learning to read—and the Church failing to provide what they should read. A moving book which should exercise the minds of Christians everywhere.

The Rev. A. M. Chirgwin's *Conflict, China, Japan, and Christ* (S.C.M., 2s.) will serve as a useful pendant to Dr. Horton's article within. As we read its informing pages we found ourselves unconsciously noting the superlatives and asking whether their frequency was due to the fact that Mr. Chirgwin is a preacher, or that the book is based on letters, or that the L.M.S. is always in a crisis! On p. 28 we have the *oddest* contrast, a *vast* courtyard, *rarely* seen a *richer* riot; on p. 29 *vast* double roofs; on p. 30 *immense* stretches, a *vast* park, a *teeming* population; on p. 31 a *magic* place, *no end* of courtyards, *massive* walls, two *supremely lovely* things. We resolved to add a guinea to our L.M.S. subscription when the General Secretary writes a thousand words without a superlative.

It is to be regretted that somebody has not saved Dr. F. J. Foakes Jackson's *A History of Church History* (Heffer, 7s. 6d.) from the many blemishes which mark its pages. Commas have been strewn about (pp. 42, 151, 157) so that they make many sentences absurd; there are many—we almost said "innumerable"—misprints, and some sorry blunders. One or two examples must suffice (italics ours):

> p. 60. Much, however, happened in the Roman Church, during the *third* century, when, two such famous martyrs as Ignatius and Justin suffered.

On p. 36 in half a page we have "fotgotten" and "exhiliarating", and among a host of other things we have noticed "Thedosius" (twice), "Funtunatus", "perocity", "vindicative", while Gibbon "*signed* as a lover, and obeyed as a son".

To turn to a pleasanter aspect of the book: its readable and stimulating pages contain "studies" on the New Testament Canon; Hippolytus; Philo; Eusebius, and his predecessors and successors; Augustine's *City of God*; Gregory of Tours; Adamnan; Bede; Anna Comnena; Burnet; Gibbon; and "The Books recommended by Bishop Lightfoot". The first essay, "The Origin and Development of Ecclesiastical History", is admirable, and should not be overlooked by those who address encyclicals to their brethren. The contrast between the idealized Church of *Acts* 1-5 and the actual Church of *Acts* 6 is noted, and its significance explained. Another paper contains a sentence which would make a good essay subject:

> In the first century baptism was readily granted; in the third it was won with difficulty; later everybody in a Christian land was baptized.

We are glad that the late Dr. J. P. Whitney lived to prepare this volume of *Reformation Essays* (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.). Printed at dates from 1912 to 1932, the five papers all make a contribution to learning which justifies their more permanent form. Especially is this true, perhaps, of the first three—"Continuity throughout the Reformation", "Erasmus", and "Luther Literature". The fourth, "Lutheran Germany and the Episcopate", seems to exaggerate the place and power of the Episcopate in the life of the Church. The fifth is a useful survey of "The Growth of Papal Jurisdiction before Nicholas I".

Mrs. Rosamond Bayne-Powell's *The English Child in the 18th Century* (Murray, 15s.) contains so much that is good that it is a pity she has not made it better. About customs and superstitions, reading and amusements, schools and toys, she has much that is informing and diverting to say. But it is rather as a chatty and entertaining narrative than as a scholarly survey of its subject that the book must be regarded; on the one hand, it is far from covering the whole ground—Miss M. G. Jones's recent *The Charity School Movement* is not so much as mentioned—and on the other, the book has far too many slips, such as "Comemius", "Bishop Burnett", "[Walter] Bessant", and "Little Lever near Botten".

All social workers should read Mrs. Cecil Chesterton's *What price Youth?* (Nicholson & Watson, 6s.). Written with first hand knowledge and passionate indignation, it shows how Britain has failed to give a fair deal to those who began life handicapped from the first because they were born in a world bemused and demoralized by war. Mrs. Chesterton is very critical of the treatment of the young delinquent and of all machine-like, red-tape methods and institutions. She has shrewd comments to make on some of Sir Samuel Hoare's proposals for prison reform, and is contemptuous of rules and regulations which forget the human element. Her plea for the multiplication of clubs for adolescents is urgent and convincing, and it is one to which churches should not turn a deaf ear. A striking book.

What *Men Without Work* did for the unemployed Dr. A. E. Morgan's *The Needs of Youth* (Oxford Press, 10s.)—"A Report Made to King George's Jubilee Trust Fund"—does for the adolescents. The Fund was fortunate in securing Dr. Morgan to carry out this survey; it is at once human and scientific, and will be a *vade mecum* for all who have to deal with youth. Education, unemployment, delinquency, leisure, voluntary organizations—with these and similar topics Dr. Morgan deals. He concludes that a system is possible wherein public funds and professional service can be combined with the voluntary help and the voluntary spirit.

To its many admirable contributions to the study of current affairs Chatham House has now added Dr. N. Micklem's very useful *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.). After succinct epitomes of *Mein Kampf* and *Der Mythus* and an account of the events leading up to the Concordat, Dr. Micklem gives a year by year historical survey from 1933 to 1938, leading up to the conclusion that now the Nazi Party is deliberately paganizing the country. Authorities are quoted throughout, and we see the process at work in taking children from their parents, in education, and by persecution in manifold ways. Sometimes Dr. Micklem becomes trite, as, *e.g.*,

> It may very well be doubted, on the one hand, whether the Pope was well advised to act so soon, and on the other, whether delay would have brought appreciable advantage.

Instead of such passages we should have welcomed facts; how far, *e.g.*, has the process gone to which we heard a Roman Catholic dignitary

refer the other day—the seizure of parish priests who simply disappear?

It is to be regretted, too, that a book which should have been completely objective is disfigured by the outrageous assertion (p. 50) that the "German Christian" position "represents the standpoint of Liberalism or Modernism in other lands". This *odium theologicum* reappears on p. 226, and it is to be found in an article in our own pages.

All who have to do with children should read Mr. Richard Ford's *Children in the Cinema* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), the first book on this increasingly important topic. Mr. Ford gives facts and statistics, outlines the problem presented by the cinema habit to parents and educationalists, manager and producer. He shows once again that the cinema is undeservedly blamed for child delinquency, and notes the change of opinion in regard to the influence of children's *matinées*. Readers engaged in Sunday School work should make special note of the Children's Cinema Clubs, which, when well run, seem to provide almost all the Sunday Schools have been accustomed to provide except definite religious teaching.

In these days much attention is being given to religious education; this makes the Rev. T. F. Kinloch's *Pioneers of Religious Education* (Milford, 3s. 6d.) all the more useful, even though he is severely handicapped by lack of space. He gives concise accounts of the work of Christian humanists, English Reformers like Nowell, the Jesuits, Comenius, August Francke, Zinzendorf, Pestalozzi, Schleiermacher, and Arnold, concluding with a chapter on the (English) Day School.

Mr. Ludwig Marcuse's *Soldier of the Church* (Methuen, 12s. 6d.) is a life of Ignatius Loyola translated from the German. Loyola's long interior struggle is described, a chapter is given to Xavier, his "best duplication", and the beginning outlined of that process whereby the Order, following the plans of its "holy managing director", was to become "a cross-fertilization of the seed of Assisi and Machiavelli. And Machiavelli was the stronger".

Readers of this biography would do well to follow it by a study of Dr. H. S. Box's *An Introduction to the Ignatian Exercises* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), a "handbook for retreat conductors".

It is to be regretted that Miss C. V. Wedgwood undertook *Oliver Cromwell* in the "Great Lives" series (Duckworth, 2s.). Her *Thirty Years' War* was so fine a piece of work that it is disappointing to find that either she has written this little book carelessly, or that she is not as well acquainted with the history of her own country as with that of the Continent. Slips in Christian names like "John Prynne" might be overlooked, but what is one to make of such a statement as "Puritanism was *tinged* with Calvinism".

The Rev. G. F. Nuttall's *Letters of John Pinney, 1679-1699* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) is a scholarly piece of work which introduces to readers the extensive archives of the Pinney family. John Pinney, Thomas Fuller's successor as Vicar of Broadwindsor, in Dorset, was ejected in 1662. He preached in the neighbourhood for some time, went to Dublin as minister of Cooke St. in 1682, and returned to Bettiscombe in 1689, often preaching at Crewkerne. He and his family were in the lace business, and their keenness will furnish evidence to those who associate Protestantism with capitalism. The son Nathaniel especially had an eye to the main chance. He will not marry

> unlesse it bee verry much to my advantage. And if you can now recomend mee to aney Such person I am ready to Imbrace the same.

In declining a suggestion of marriage with a lady with £800, he says, "I do not overstand my Market . . . for a £1000 fortune I can have dayley when I please". Pinney seems to have had constant worries about his children: Azariah was in the Monmouth rebellion and was transported; four daughters did not please him by their marriages; and Hester seems to have married the lace business on the Royal Exchange, though it is to be doubted whether she listened, any more than her sisters, to her father's matrimonial warnings.

Mr. Nuttall has done his work well. He has been a little too sparing of his notes: we can imagine, to take p. 18 as an illustration, that some readers will hesitate over "trune", "bat", "passones", "apasshin", "seade".

We are sorry that Mr. James Sutherland's *Background for Queen Anne* (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) contains the boring account of Marlborough's funeral, for the preceding essays fascinate alike by their subject and the style in which they are written. Mr. Sutherland's subjects are "Burridge the Blasphemer", "John Lacy and the Modern Prophets", "Dr. Swift in London", "The Last Years of Joseph Addison", "Miss Addison", and "Young Matthews". The first three of these are especially well done. We shall be on the look-out for other work from Mr. Sutherland's pen.

Had Dr. R. W. Jackson limited his *Jonathan Swift, Dean and Pastor* (S.P.C.K., 6s.) to an apologia which described the Dean's care for his cathedral, his pulpit, his choir, and the people of his "liberty", the book would rightly have been deemed both useful and necessary. But the author's bravery extends to the defence of Swift as a preacher and as a man; here we have special pleading, naïvely revealed in the words

> But any discerning churchman must admit that if Swift was sincere in his personal creed, there was no other possible course for him to take.

"Any discerning churchman"! It almost looks as if Dr. Jackson has caught some of the Dean's antipathy to Dissenters. Sometimes too he is inconsistent. Declaring that "hypocrisy is a trait which was absolutely foreign to the man" he nevertheless points out that Swift held that "hypocrisy is more eligible than open infidelity and vice" and "the practice of mock piety would often bring the real thing in its train".

In *Jedidiah Morse* (Columbia & Oxford Presses, 12s. 6d.) Mr. J. K. Morse by the aid of unpublished letters tells of the main episodes in the life of that "champion of New England Orthodoxy", Jedidiah Morse. Calvinism v. Arminianism, Trinitarianism v. Unitarianism, Andover v. Harvard, in all these struggles Morse was protagonist, assuming "the championship of a cause which he professed was dearer to him than life". He was a valiant fighter, but this book leaves him in 1819 defeated, relinquishing his thirty years' pastorate at Charlestown at the request of his congregation. The controversies with which Morse was concerned still vex the Church of Christ, and perhaps always will, though probably there is no Congregationalist left who would declare with Dr. Emmons:

> Associationism leads to Consociationism; Consociationism leads to Presbyterianism; Presbyterianism leads to Episcopacy; Episcopacy leads to Roman Catholicism; and Roman Catholicism is an ultimate fact.

It must be remembered that these controversies date from the period when the Terror of the French Revolution still dominated men, a time when the word "democracy" frightened "respectable" Congregationalists. "I

consider", writes Morse, "Unitarianism as the democracy of Christianity" —and that was the worst name he could think of.

In *Leader by Destiny* (Harrap, 8s. 6d.) Miss Jeanette Eaton tells for young people—and tells well—the story of the life of George Washington. The illustrations are a feature of a successful volume.

A short life—he died when he was 36; a brief spell in Parliament and a briefer in the Government; a reputation as a wit and as a writer of "*vers de société* in its most perfected form and its exactest sense" at Eton, Cambridge, and in the wider-world—such was the life of Winthrop Mackworth Praed. Mr. Derek Hudson tells the story in *A Poet in Parliament* (Murray, 12s. 6d.), a readable narrative which, if it exaggerates Praed's place in English literature, does leave the reader wondering on the place he might have occupied in life and letters had his life been prolonged.

In *Life of Lord Redesdale* (Longmans, 15s.), the late Miss Eveline B. Mitford has given the world a dutiful account of John Mitford, Lord Chancellor of Ireland in the early years of the Union. The biography stresses Mitford's excellent qualities as a judge and a responsible statesman, but skates lightly over the extreme conservatism which made him a friend and supporter of Eldon. Not the least interesting of its pages are those which deal with Mitford's work on the Commission on the State of the Public Records.

Readers of these pages are aware that we rank Adler first among the psychologists of the last generation, an opinion which is confirmed by Dr. Orgler's **Alfred Adler, the Man and his Work* (Daniel, 8s. 6d.), which is all that a book of this kind should be—well-informed in its facts, sound in its judgments, and with a sympathy with its subject which, though deep, is not uncritical. Mrs. Orgler knew Adler personally, and is intimately acquainted with both the theory and practice of individual psychology. She shows how Adler's life and work were inter-related, and makes him live for her readers. Adler's death in 1937 removed one of the sanest of the workers in this particular field, and nowhere saner than in that he dealt with normal people and ordinary life rather than with pathological cases. Decidedly a book to read.

Miss Olive Wyon has done well to tell the story of Emma Pieczynska, which she has called **Radiant Freedom* (Lutterworth Press, 3s. 6d.). Born in Paris of French-Swiss parents, Emma as a girl acquired a passionate love of Poland; without loving him she married a Polish nobleman, and when the desired children did not arrive, the marriage broke down. She then spent five years training as a doctor, but was frequently ill, and at last became stone deaf, to discover that "suffering is a kind of priesthood, far more efficacious than the spoken word". She was a mystic yet practical withal, a pioneer in sex education and social reform generally, and with a pastoral gift which enabled her to help many people. Special mention should be made of the quotations which precede the chapters.

We must confess that Psichari does not attract us and Mr. Wallace Fowlie's "study in religious conversion", *Ernest Psichari* (Clarke, 3s. 6d.), with its ponderous style, did nothing to win our enthusiasm. Psichari, a grandson of Renan, was killed in the early days of the war at the age of 30. It is perhaps just to call him one of the decadents, who, having failed to find in sensuality that which satisfied, became an ardent patriot, and finally an ardent Catholic contemplating the priesthood. His conversion was in large measure due to his friend Jacques Maritain, who continually urged the claims of religion during Psichari's army life in Africa. In 1912,

writing to Maritain, Ernest called himself "un Catholique sans la foi"; soon after he became a practising Catholic. He left behind him half a dozen works of varying merit, but none of them is likely to live.

Those who speak the language of Keswick will enjoy another "Life" of one of Keswick's best-known figures—the Rev. E. L. Langston's *Bishop Taylor Smith* (Marshall, Morgan, 7s. 6d.). Lacking early training and of no intellectual eminence, Taylor Smith earned the respect of men of all Churches and of none by the consistency and courage of his Christian witness. Never afraid to "button-hole" those in high places and in low, he was always trying to "win souls"; to this end he used his position as African Bishop and as Chaplain-General, often with amazing results. His limitations are perhaps too obvious to those with modernist inclinations, but it is better to forget them in gratitude for the work he did.

There are so many facets to Prof. R. G. Collingwood's fascinating *Autobiography* (Milford, 7s. 6d.) that one scarcely knows which to admire first. A youthful prodigy and a bit of a prig, as he confesses, Prof. Collingwood was fortunate in having the kind of training which well fitted him to attempt the double *rapprochement* between philosophy and history, theory and practice, which he desired. Philosophers will follow with zest his undermining of realism; historians will profit by the study of his philosophy of history, illustrated by his distinguished work on Roman Britain. Politicians will perhaps be amazed at the strength of his feeling against the National Government and Mr. Chamberlain for "tricking" and "deceiving" the country. In Spain in 1930 and 1931 Prof. Collingwood found a democratic revolution proceeding in orderly fashion; there were no atrocities and religious worship was undisturbed. That stories about "atrocities" and "the Reds" came to be broadcast later Prof. Collingwood attributes to the same forces which produced "non-intervention", Munich, and the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. Why he should so frequently, at 50, call himself an old man, is not clear, but it is good to know that in future he is determined to "fight in the daylight" against Fascism, which "means the end of all clear thinking and the triumph of irrationalism".

Mrs. H. M. Taylor's autobiography, *No one to blame* (Cape, 7s. 6d.), makes us frankly uneasy—not so much because the blurb suggests the book is "in the tradition of Mark Rutherford", but because sometimes the narrative does not ring true: one who has taught in a denominational school would know that the correct idiom is "managers" not "directors", and there are other examples. That being said, there is much in this intimate narrative deserving of attention. It purports to be the story of a consumptive Lancashire weaver, a sickly and unwanted child afflicted by deafness and a chronic cough. She attempted to secure freedom by becoming a missionary or a deaconess, and here there are unpleasant accounts of snobbery in religious circles. From Methodism she turned to spiritualism, and from spiritualism to socialism. For many years she cared for her invalid mother, and marriage failed to give her all she hoped. Now she has come to believe that psycho-analysis would have made all the difference to her and that it could help many people in similar situations. Somebody ought to count the number of times "ambivalent" is used: it is worse than any King Charles's head.

Rarely can a life have been so eventful as that of Mrs. Melina Rorke, and rarely can adventures have been transferred to print more effectively than in her autobiography, *Melina Rorke* (Harrap, 10s. 6d.). Melina, a girl of 14, escaped from her convent to marry Frederick Rorke, an Irish footballer whom she had met twice. He was killed in a football match

almost at once, and the girl of 15 was left widow and mother—we are spared nothing in the description of her accouchement, when a drunken doctor brought her child into the world. Soon she is in Kimberley, living among diamond diggers and buyers, and the famous names in South African history—Rhodes, Jameson, Barnato, Olive Schreiner—begin to flit across her pages. Still a child herself, she starts out with her brother and her baby on a long trek to Bulawayo, where she meets Kruger and lives through the Matabele rebellion under Lobengula. The Jameson raid and the new Matabele rising bring further exciting adventures. These are the prelude to training for nursing (in England), the establishment of a nursing-home in Bulawayo, and the South African War, where she ran hospitals and finally entered Mafeking with the relief force. Decorated by Edward VII with the Order of the Red Cross, she received a tumultuous welcome on arriving home, but the joy is shattered by a new tragedy. Mrs. Rorke tells of her own love affairs and those of her family in a book which really does throb with vitality: G. A. Henty and Ethel M. Dell are surpassed in its thrilling pages.

Mr. R. H. Kiernan's *Baden-Powell* (Harrap, 3s. 6d.) is as exciting as any thriller, and many who are not Scouts will revel in its pages. Too often Baden-Powell's own scouting is forgotten in the movement he created, and Mr. Kiernan is at his best in telling of days in the Secret Service and in the Ashanti War. Whether he is equally happy in his references to Cromwell's Army may be doubted.

If Prof. Irwin Edman can teach as well as he can write, students of philosophy at Columbia University are to be envied, for **Philosopher's Holiday* (Constable, 10s.) is one of the most delightful books we have read for some time. If the epigram he quotes be true—"A professor of philosophy studies philosophy: a philosopher studies life"—in this book he shows himself philosopher as well as professor. The book is almost impossible to describe or review. It consists of what might be called autobiographical sketches, in which the writer tells of his youth, his teachers, his students, his work, his sabbatical years, the people he has met, the things he has observed, the ideas that have been the fashion for a time, the music and the poetry he loves.

Shrewd yet kindly, scholar yet no recluse, with a background of culture yet *au fait* with the rising generation and modern trends, Prof. Edman has given us a volume which will give pleasure to thousands of readers. And Englishmen will do well to ponder what he has to say in "Some Englishmen".

Mr. Edward Thompson, having entertained himself in writing *You Have Lived Through All This* (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.), will without doubt entertain his readers too. He reminds them of things that have happened during the last twenty years, and indulges in scathing comment on British policy and British Premiers. He is, of course, very Left, and very anti-Chamberlain, and as gloomy about the outlook as he is critical about the past. His sense of humour—and that is sometimes vitriolic—does something to mitigate his anger and disgust, but many readers will find relief, instruction, and amusement in his digressions—on the use of "but", and on reviewing and advertisements (the whole chapter on "Literature and the Arts of Life" is pointed and useful). The chapter on "Moral Rearmament" is in keeping with the rest of the book, but Mr. Thompson scarcely sees the whole of the picture; here especially he seems very much a *laudator temporis acti*.

Miss Sally Graves has managed to pack a great deal into her *History of Socialism* (Gollancz, 5s.), and has increased the value of a useful book

by a biographical appendix of 20 pp. If she does seem to overstress the importance of the recent conflict in Spain she has nevertheless provided a book of reference which students of social and economic history will find very serviceable.

Anthologies on freedom seem to be catching the fancy. *A Handbook of Freedom* (Lawrence & Wishart, 6s.), "chosen by Jack Lindsay and Edgell Rickword", is a "Record of English Democracy Through Twelve Centuries". It has the economic bias we must expect in these days—Wat Tyler, the Diggers, and their like get a full share—and there are striking omissions (Edward Carpenter's "England, Arise", *e.g.*), but nevertheless the compilation is full of interest. We are glad to see Samuel Bamford coming to his own. An "E" has been dropped from "PAINE" on p. 222.

Sometimes we have had occasion to deplore the extravagances of anti-vivisectionists and other animal lovers whose violence does harm to the cause they have at heart. It is therefore with the greater pleasure that we commend Father Aloysius Roche's *These Animals of Ours* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) which is all the more valuable in that it is a Roman Catholic scholar's examination of the whole subject of the relation of man to the animal creation. A book of this kind is much more convincing than a compound of anger and maudlin sentiment.

Those who desire to understand Roman Catholic teaching about marriage may turn to Bishop von Streng's *Marriage* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.), the third edition of which has been translated into English by Dr. C. P. Bruehl. It is a book of "instructions for the married and for those who contemplate marriage".

Mr. G. Warburg's *Six Years of Hitler* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) tells of the experience of the Jews under the Nazi *régime*. Every statement is documented either from the Nazi writings themselves or from the responsible press, and the whole makes the heart sick. The cold-blooded persecution and brutality, the persistent harrying and tightening of the screw, is certain to bring its nemesis.

Mr. Rom Landau says that the English rush into writing. Well, he has not done so badly himself since he settled in England, and in *Love for a Country* (Nicholson & Watson, 12s. 6d.) he has found the easiest possible way of writing a book—to call on distinguished people and secure their replies to his questions. We have never been able to rave about Mr. Landau's books, and it was perhaps particularly unfortunate that we turned first to the section on the Free Churches. The two Free Churchmen interviewed were Dr. Scott Lidgett and Mr. Angus Watson, and the latter is made to say that "John Brown" was "the founder of the Congregational Church", and that "One of the fathers of our Church once said, 'There is still more light to break through God's most Holy Scriptures' ". Frequently it is obvious that Mr. Landau's knowledge is superficial only; clearly he knows nothing of the north of England, and after his remarks about cleanliness he would do well to avoid Yorkshire and Lancashire women. He manages to discuss the English theatre—or to evade discussing it—without mentioning Mr. Shaw, who, with Mr. J. B. Priestley (who provides perhaps the best pages in the book) and others, in themselves refute Mr. Landau's depreciation. A disproportionate space is given to homo-sexuality, and there are slips like "Hilda MacMillan". Nevertheless at times there is food for thought; a Roman Catholic authority, *e.g.*, says that last year 45 per cent of Sir Oswald Mosley's followers were Roman Catholics.

Congregational interest in Prof. E. Allison Peers, the sweet reasonableness with which he writes, and his enthusiasm for Spain, cannot dispel the atmosphere of special pleading which lies heavily over his *Spain, The Church and The Orders* (Eyre & Spottiswoode, 10s. 6d.). Prof. Peers accepts all the Spanish Bishops tell him, even such statements as "the vast majority of our Communists have at the moment of their death been reconciled to the God of their fathers". In his anxiety to prove that the persecution of Roman Catholics is not merely anti-clerical but anti-God, he trembles like a retired General terrified of Socialist Sunday Schools! He does not seem to see that modern Spain is in itself the main indictment of the worshipping Church he defends; what is the use of packed churches if they do not remove the hatred and cruelty, the ignorance and superstition, which disfigure the face of Spain? Nevertheless it is good to be reminded of the history of the Order and of the services to learning of so many religious and seculars alike.

Miss A. M. Pullen's gifts as a teller of stories to children are seen to advantage in *The Stories Jesus Loved when He was young,* while the late Rev. E. Dentith Davies draws on a long experience in the addresses in *The Sunny Side of the Hedge* (both Indep. Press, 2s. 6d.).

In *Dr. Norton's Wife* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) Miss Mildred Walker has given us a very successful novel. Norton is a brilliant Professor of Medicine greatly respected by his students; his childless wife is stricken down by an incurable disease which incapacitates her more and more; her younger sister, a divorced wife with a little girl, comes to keep house. What happens we will not narrate; the characters are skilfully drawn and the story holds the reader, though they may feel "had" in the end.

All who read and write and print and publish and sell books will find Miss Marjorie Plant's *The English Book Trade* (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) a fascinating account of the making and selling of books in England. The volume is packed with information, and is a real contribution to the social and economic history of Britain. How books were and are printed, the mysteries of binding and bookselling, the relations between author and publisher, the problem of copyright—such are the topics which fill these entrancing pages. Miss Plant might have found useful illustrative material in such monographs as the Bibliographical Society's "Richard Schilders". A volume on which the author is to be warmly congratulated.

Best-Sellers: Are They Born or Made? (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) makes a fitting appendage to Miss Plant's book. Mr. Stanley Unwin opens with "The Advertising of Books"; from America Mr. George Stevens deals with the same subject under the title "Lincoln's Doctor's Dog and other Famous Best Sellers"; and in arguing that "advertising does not sell books" Mr. Frank Swinnerton, like the other contributors, has much to say on "Authors and Advertising".

In his *Studies in Keats* (1930) Mr. Middleton Murry did some of his best work. To the essays in that volume he has added three others to make *Studies in Keats New and Old* (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.). The new papers are "The Poet and the Dreamer", "Keats and Milton", and "Keats and Wordsworth". We imagine that Mr. Murry's views of Milton will scarcely commend themselves to many readers of these pages: a recent avowal of the Archbishop of York will perhaps incline Mr. Murry to present himself for ordination in the Province of York.

Having seen Mr. Bernard Shaw's *Geneva* (Constable, 7s. 6d. and 5s.) within a week of reading the play we have been able to conclude that it is

better to see a play before reading it: Mr. Ernest Thesiger's masterly "Sir Orpheus Midlander" and Mr. Cecil Trouncer's almost equally good "Bombardone" illumine speeches that would not have full effect on one who had not seen the play: how can one realize how Sir Orpheus says "I don't know" without hearing it? The script, even plus Mr. Feliks Topolski's illustrations, is not equal to the play on the stage, where it went very well. Mr. Shaw so obviously enjoys himself in this "fancied page of history" that we are obliged to join in his octogenarian gambols, and to ponder on the significance of the final words when the Judge of the International Court says of the Dictators: "They blustered; they defied us. But they came. They came". But perhaps Herr Hitler said the same thing about Mr. Chamberlain and Munich!

The tragic death of Herr Ernst Toller lends a pathetic interest to his play *Pastor Hall* (Lane, 5s.), well translated by Mr. Stephen Spender. Toller has done virile work, and it is sad to think we shall see no more of it. The persecution which led him to take his own life is the subject of this play, the three scenes of which are set in the pastor's home, in a concentration camp, and in the home of a general of the old *régime,* whose son the pastor's daughter was to have married. The play vividly interprets one phase of life in Germany to-day.

In *The Devil to Pay* (Gollancz, 5s.) Miss Dorothy L. Sayers has "got away with it" once again; and deservedly, for it required audacity to take up this familiar theme. The play makes the reader desire to go and see it at the earliest possible moment, if only to see how hell's mouth and the magic appear on the stage.

Judging from the criticisms, the first production of the plays at the Malvern Festival was extremely disappointing. From the two plays now published (Constable, 2s. 6d.), Mr. James Bridie's *What Say They?* and Sir Robert Vansittart's *Dead Heat,* it is not difficult to see the reason why. Though Mr. Bridie is far below his best, his play is much superior to Sir Robert's, for his people are at any rate alive, which is more than can be said of most of the characters in *Dead Heat.* And we are in entire agreement with Sir Robert—"And what is the good of this Preface anyhow?"

Mr. J. L. Hodson knows his Lancashire, and his *Jonathan North* (Gollancz, 8s. 6d.) is perhaps the best thing he has done. Mr. H. G. Wells compares Jonathan with Arnold Bennett's "Card", and no more appropriate description could be found. Once again we note the absence of religion in the modern novel, reflecting its absence in the lives of so many people to-day. Mr. Hodson has written a powerful story which, alike in its presentation of normal life in a Lancashire town and of war days, bears the hall-mark of reality. The Court scene is well done.

Mrs. Alyse Simpson, the writer of *The Convent* (Dent, 8s. 6d.), became a novice of the Convent of the Mystic Rose at the age of 20, hoping there to find peace. Before she convinced herself she had no vocation and ran away, she had two years of convent life, which she now describes with the intimacy and authority of personal experience. The account is nevertheless objective. The effect of the unnatural life on the nuns—hysteria, illness of mind and body, frequent tuberculosis—is well brought out, and the reaction of women of different temperaments clearly described. When she leaves she makes a pact to return and see her two closest friends in 20 years' time; she finds one of them Mother Superior and dead to the world, the other at the point of death from tuberculosis—and life at the convent continuing as when she lived in it. A well-written and convincing narrative.

The Valley of Baca (Jenkins, 7s. 6d.) is another of Mr. W. Riley's healthy and well-told stories of the Yorkshire dales. Mr. Riley is not afraid to introduce religion into his novels, and many who are satiated by the spate of stories which tell of people with no religion at all in their lives will rejoice in one of a happier sort.

The anonymous *The Man Who Killed Hitler* (Laurie, 3s. 6d.) is the story of an Aryan doctor who, his Jewish wife having been murdered by the Nazis, determines to rid the world of the Führer. To summarize the story would destroy the reader's interest in a book which depicts the horrors of Nazidom so faithfully that the squeamish had better leave it alone.

EDITOR.

Mr. George A. Birmingham (Canon J. O. Hannay) is well-known to us all as a novelist. In *God's Iron* (Skeffington, 7s. 6d.), he follows up his previous study of *Isaiah* by a reconstruction of the life of the prophet *Jeremiah*. Whilst using to the full his gift of imagination in making the prophet live before us, this use is soberly restrained and always subordinated to the knowledge obtainable by a critical study of the Biblical book. He naturally follows Skinner's classical volume, *Prophecy and Religion*, but does not hesitate to take his own line on numerous points. His historical background is not always as clear as it might be, notably in the relations of Egypt and Assyria in the time of Josiah, and in regard to the return from exile. He has not grasped the real significance of the realistic "symbolism" of prophecy, and we do not think any scholar would endorse his early dating of the *Apocalypse of Baruch*. His "version" of the poems is often rather a paraphrase than a translation, but sufficiently serves the purpose of the book. For the general reader, the reconstruction is on the whole an excellent one, and thoroughly to be commended. The emphasis in the selection of incident falls in the right place and the portrait painted is that of a man of like passions with ourselves who really lived.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Signor Mario Bendiscioli's *The New Racial Paganism* (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) is an essay which explains the nature of the new religion of People, Blood, and Soil as it appears in Germany today. The book is at once scientific and popular. It is in effect a commentary on the late Pope's famous encyclical *Mit brennender Sorge*, and a reliable introduction to the subject.

M. Robert D'Harcourt's *The German Catholics* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) suffers from a somewhat misleading title. It is really an impassioned plea to Roman Catholics to appreciate the significance of the religious war in Germany. It is written with much knowledge and is a book of some importance. It is a great pity that the author did not bring his record up to date for the English translation. Some of his judgments, as for instance concerning the Centre Party, are open to serious question, and he shows no understanding of the part played by the Protestants. The book has not the grasp upon central issues shown by Signor Bendiscioli, but it is a record of much interest.

N. MICKLEM.

In *Christianity or the New Paganism* (Muller, 5s.), Mr. Henry Brinton gives us a shrewd diagnosis of our present ills, and suggests that the only way of escape lies in the rigorous application of the Christian gospel and the Christian values to our social, political, and economic life. To him the new paganism is represented mainly by the present *régime* in Germany and its counterparts elsewhere. Thus he lumps together Communism, Roman

Catholicism, Fascism, and the Oxford Group, and regards their authoritarianism as the enemy of reason and the cause of the decline of idealism. He has a good deal to say of the impact of modern scientific research on religion, and the necessity of adjusting many of our religious ideas accordingly. The weakest part of his book is in his description of what Christianity really is, but he is very good on Christian pacifism, and on democracy's need of the Christian values. He believes "that the churches are slowly coming to realize that the material welfare and political liberty of man is essentially their concern". His treatment of the question of marriage and sex relations generally is marred by some lapses from good taste, but in spite of this the book as a whole is suggestive and stimulating, and is calculated to produce just that kind of "concern" which good people greatly need.

W. B. Selbie.

We have read with much appreciation *The Creed of an Evangelical* (Lutterworth Press, 1s. 6d.), which reproduces the addresses given at this year's Islington Clerical Conference. They are written by men who know their Bibles, and who, unlike many Anglican writers, are proud of the heritage of the Reformers, and not ashamed of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and who, although they prize the Church, know that men are saved by God's grace, and since this grace "is essentially a personal activity", it requires the response of faith. It is unfortunate that the Evangelical position was not more strongly represented on the Commission which drew up the Report on *Doctrine in the Church of England*. This little book provides a needed corrective to that Report, and, since it is the manifesto of one party, has a definiteness of teaching lacking in that Report. We commend it cordially to the attention of Free Church readers, who will prize its clarity of statement and its warmth of zeal.

Sydney Cave.

Dr. G. S. Stewart's *The Lower Levels of Prayer* (S.C.M., 5s.) will be found an admirable guide in the practice of prayer, both in overcoming the hindrances to prayer, and in understanding how to pray, and what to pray for. This is most useful pastoral theology, and it has behind it a rich experience. A better title might perhaps have been given to the book. How often the simplest petitions are prayer at its highest! The mystic's exaltation is rare and of short duration; most of us must pray in our workaday clothes.

The Rev. John Kearney's *Learn of Me* (Burns, Oates, 6s.) is similar in its purpose to Dr. Stewart's book, but it is from the Catholic position, and worked out in much more detail. Father Kearney is well known as a spiritual guide, and he provides here the materials for meditation on the spiritual life. This is a work of devotion with insight into human nature, and an understanding of the perplexities which beset the ordinary man.

The translation by Miss Elsie Codd of Ida Coudenhove's *Mary Ward* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is one of the Catholic Book Club publications. The book itself tells in the disguise of a romance the story of this seventeenth century Catholic mystic, beginning with her north country English life, and dealing with the short-lived Institute she founded at St. Omer. The story belongs to the penal days of Catholicism in England, and in this semi-romantic form is not free from a hint of propaganda. Mary Ward was a remarkable woman, with a touch of St. Teresa's masterfulness which got her into disfavour with her own authorities. The life is well worth knowing, and the translation reads easily.

Mrs. Marjorie Noel How, a deacon at Park Chapel, Crouch End, has published under the title *Hidden Worlds* (Harmony Press, 2s. 6d.) a collec-

tion of poems which have a fine spiritual sensitiveness, and poetical gift. Mrs. How is aware of the unseen which lies so near, and yet to the unawakened spirit seems so distant; and she can give to homeliest things the accent of the eternal. Occasionally her gift fails, but this happens rarely; the total impression these poems make is of a mind which knows the "hidden worlds" and can reveal them. Among the poems is a tribute to "Alice Meynell", and the poem entitled "Light" is perhaps the best in the book. Happily Mrs. How gives us no "Vers Libre" but keeps to the older and better ways of poetry.

As an act of piety, or possibly as a literary recreation, the Rev. Canice Donleavy's *Sonnets on the Psalms* (Burns, Oates, 5s.) is praiseworthy; but to write a sonnet on each of the Psalms calls for great skill, first of all as an interpreter, and then for more than ordinary ability in the use of the sonnet. On the question of interpretation any one of the Psalms comes differently to different men; Mr. Donleavy is entitled to full liberty of interpretation. But the sonnet is another matter, and it must be said that most of these sonnets go heavily and lack that grace without which the sonnet fails. That on "The Lord is my Shepherd" gives little idea of the simplicity and beauty of that Psalm; and when in the case of another Psalm one finds the words "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like unto them that dream", tumbled down in the sonnet into "The thought of being set free now makes us swoon"—well, the whole thing scarcely seems worth the effort. Let us never cease to be thankful for the Authorized Version.

The Rev. Alan Walker's *There is always God* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.) is a rather desultory survey of Church life in England. It is slight, and little more than a series of impressions as Mr. Walker has wandered over the country. On page 78 Mr. Walker says, "The Congregational Church has suggested, *etc.*". It may seem a small point; but there is no such thing as "The Congregational Church": there is the "Congregational Union", a very different thing; and there are Congregational Churches. But there is much of interest to be found in the book.

The Rev. V. A. Demant's *The Religious Prospect* (Muller, 7s. 6d.) goes into ultimate questions of philosophy which are in the background of the present religious confusion. His account of Protestant "liberalism" finds there the same error which is also behind the totalitarian theories; both alike treat man as explained by the stream of events, and see in him nothing transcendental, a being who is what he is because he has his being in God. The analysis is carried through with much patience and learning. What then is the need if the religious prospect is not to be dark and foreboding? Mr. Demant's answer is that there must be a return to the traditional and historic Christian philosophy; and by this he seems to mean a modified renascence of St. Thomas Aquinas. Perhaps Mr. Demant is not quite fair to historic Protestantism, nor to the modern school of Karl Barth. The trend of the book is that the future for the Christian faith is in a revival of Catholic philosophy. This may, or may not, be true. But Mr. Demant's book deserves very careful reading; and for all it has a certain dryness of style, it will be found profitable reading.

Mr. A. Morgan Young's *The Rise of a Pagan State* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.), following on his recent book, *Imperial Japan,* is a most apposite inquiry into the religious background of Japan. Mr. Young is one of our best-versed scholars in things Japanese, and here he writes with an ease and fullness of knowledge which makes his book of the greatest interest at the present time. Much of it is taken up with the sources of Japan's be-

liefs, and especially its deification of the Emperors. There is a great deal of valuable anthropology in the book, and it is more than scientific bookwork. If one might say so, Mr. Young lets his own political opinions on recent Japanese policy sometimes run away with him; and supposing the present mind of Japan to be as bad as Mr. Young says, one is driven to ask if the explanation is in the religious background alone, and not in other things. There is such a thing as catching the Imperialist fever from the West. This is a valuable book.

Dr. David Forsyth's *How Life Began* (Heinemann, 5s.) is frankly described as a "speculative study". It is the work of a mind highly trained in science, and in some danger of not seeing the wood for the trees. Everything reduces in the end to physico-chemical reactions. It is quite incredible that this explains life's origin. As a speculation Dr. Forsyth makes it interesting; but, to speak plainly, he knows no more than I do how life began.

A. T. S. JAMES.

Canon Roger Lloyd's *The Golden Middle Age* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.) is a popular account of the twelfth century and in particular of "the wandering scholars" and their "sudden passion for learning". It is based mainly on good secondary authorities, such as Lane Poole, Hastings Rashdall, and Coulton, and owes much to Miss Waddell. It does not claim to be more than the holiday task of an amateur and is written with verve. Its central character, naturally enough, is John of Salisbury, who is compared with Balfour for his mixture of scepticism and faith (p. 175). The author considers extremism "the corner-stone of the medieval character" (p. 117). Gilbert de la Porrée is always called Gilbert Porée (except in the index), and *Manichaeism* has become *Marischeeism* on p. 177. Use might have been made of Professor Powicke's lecture on Medieval Education, in which he distinguishes the wandering scholars from "the real thing" (*Christian Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 81).

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (July). Mr. E. E. Kellett is always refreshing. His "Macbeth and Satan" is followed by two articles by Congregationalists, Dr. Garvie's "Sin: Guilt and Grace"; and the Rev. A. M. Chirgwin's "Religion and Politics in Japan". Dr. Bett writes on "A Theological Hiatus"; the Rev. W. Bardsley Brash on "W. B. Yeats"; Dr. E. L. Allen on "The Message of Karl Jaspers"; Dr. F. M. Harrison on "Two Johns: Bunyan and Wesley" and Mr. C. H. S. Willson on "Traherne and Wordsworth". There are some useful Notes and Discussions.

Hibbert Journal (July). A varied number, with Dr. Olof Kinberg on "Mental Disease as a Present Factor in the Causation of War" and Baron Von Oppell on "The Strange Life-Destinies of Elisabeth Ney and Edmund Montgomery (1833-1907)" as perhaps the most interesting items. Among other articles are Baron Palmstierna's "Field-Psychics and Thought", Sir Richard C. Tute's "Indications that the Universe is Alive", the Rev. W. J. Blyton's "Personal Immortality as an Essential Constituent of the Christian Faith", Dr. Edward Lyttelton's "A Challenge to Novelists", and Dr. H. McLachlan's "An Almost forgotten Pioneer in New Testament Criticism". Dr. Moffatt surveys recent theological literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (July). Dr. Wheeler Robinson opens with an important article "Believers' Baptism and the Holy Spirit". Contributions are equally divided between general and historical topics. Among them may be noted the Rev. G. J. M. Pearce's "The State as God" and the Rev. Selwyn Gummer's "Trosnant Academy".

The Layman (July). The Rev. J. H. Marker tells of "Thirty-two Years in the Congo", the Rev. E. Rees of "The Baptists in Wales". Dr. H. R. Williamson writes on "The B.M.S. in the Sino-Japanese Conflict".

Modern Churchman (June & July). Articles that should be read are the Rev. P. R. Smythe's "St. Paul and the Institution of the Eucharist", the Rev. John Todd's "Mithraism and the Christian Sacraments", and Canon Bezzant's "History in the Gospels".

The Evangelical Quarterly (July). The Rev. F. A. Aston writes on "The Servant of the Lord in *Isaiah* 53", Dr. John Macleod has an article concerning "The Successors of Knox", and Dr. M. C. Casella discusses Buonaiuti's views of Luther and the German Reformation.

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Seventh Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" deals with the illegitimate child and with the Royal Visit to Canada, Miss Dalgleish writes on "The Poetry of Edward Thompson", Arthur Rowntree on "Thomas Ellwood", and an autobiographical article by J. W. Harvey Theobald looks back over an active life.

Expository Times (July-Sept.). The contributions under "After Fifty Years" are Dr. Cave's "The Significance of the Apostle Paul", Canon Mozley's "The Real Unity of the New Testament" and Prof. J. M. Graham's "Revelation and the Bible". Under "Problems of Today" we have Prof. Line's "The Nature of our Knowledge of God" and Principal Urquhart's "Recent Developments in the Theological Attitude to Missions". Among other contributions are Dr. G. D. Henderson's "Fifty Years of the S.C.M.".

International Review of Missions (July). Tambaram still dominates the journal. Dr. T.-C. Chao writes on "Revelation", Prof. Cunliffe-Jones on "The Meaning of the Church", and Dr. H. W. Hobson on "The Birth at Madras". Three articles on "The Christian Home" are important, and so is Dr. Latourette's "The World Fellowship of Christians and World Peace". Dr. C. S. Miao writes on "The Training of the Ministry in the Younger Churches", Dr. H. C. Trowell on "Public Health in British Tropical Africa", Dr. H. Anet on "The Educational Problem in Belgian Congo", and Miss Emma W. Wilson on "Christian Missions and the Unmarried Woman in Chinese Society".

World Dominion (April). The opening article on "Talks on Tambaram" is followed by Dr. J. Douglas Adam's "Living in Eternity". Wayfarer's "The Future of Religion in Spain" should be read, and also Dr. McLeish's "Unoccupied Areas of the World", Dr. J. T. Tucker's "Awakened Angola", and Mr. K. G. Grubb's "Where Turkey Stands". Other contributors deal with Jugoslavia, Rumania, West Africa, Arabia, Brazil and Japan.

Religion in Education (July). The Rev. K. Riches discusses The New Cambridgeshire Syllabus and the Rev. J. W. C. Dougall "Christian Education and the Younger Churches". Dr. W. F. Howard writes on "The Study of the Fourth Gospel", and the Rev. W. Tonge on "The Problem of Moral Instruction". Miss Swainson tells of "The Preferences of Elementary School Children in Scripture".

Social Service Review (May-July). The value of this little magazine would be increased were it received earlier. Among the articles worthy of attention in these numbers are the one on Oxford House, Mr. M. B. Reckitt's "A New Remedy for Agricultural Depression", and Mr. A. E. Willcox's "Democracy's Youth Service".

The Common Room (July). This number of the Journal of the Educational Settlements Association has for its most interesting contribution Mr. T. Glyn Davies's "Films in Adult Education".

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (May). The main articles are Mr. T. L. Trost's "Can God be Eliminated from our Thinking?", Mr. F. O. Erb's "History of the Adult Education Movement" and Mr. C. J. Oxley's "The Preacher —a Man of Words".

The Yale Review (Summer). An interesting number, though we do not share the Editor's good opinion of Hans Otto Storm's story which fills more than 30 pages: the simplicity of Miss Canfield's "Nothing Ever Happens" is to our mind much more effective. The political articles are good: Prof. Carl Becker's "When Democratic Virtues Disintegrate"; Mr. J. T. Flynn's "Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Roosevelt"; and Mr. E. A. Falk's "British Power Since Jutland". The Diary of an Austrian Officer in Vienna who committed suicide after the Anschluss is very moving.

Religion in Life (Summer). Dr. D. C. Macintosh asks "After Prohibition and Repeal, What?". Dr. F. C. Grant writes on "The Church's Present Task", Dr. R. W. Frank on "The American Community and the Protestant Church", and Dr. A. A. Hunter on "The Unnoticed Irony of Christ". An article by Dr. E. S. Parsons on "Lyman Abbott" will interest many people.

Review and Expositor (July). This number is largely domestic, dealing with the problems of Southern Baptist Churches. Four contributors write on Baptists in 1975!

Anglican Theological Review (July). The Church Congress Syllabus is continued, Dr. F. C. Grant this time outlining a Syllabus and Bibliography on The Nature of the Church. Other articles are the Rev. J. B. Bernardin's "The Church in the New Testament" and Prof. F. L. Filson's "The Separation of Christianity from Judaism".

In Extremis (No. 3) contains a Whitsuntide sermon, *Von der Erneuerung der Gemeinschaft,* by Pfarrer Walter Lüthi, and an address by Karl Barth entitled *L'Eglise et la question politique d'aujourd'hui.*

Nouvelle Revue Théologique (May-August). In the May number Dr. H. Doms and Père Boigelot discuss *Du sens et de la fin du mariage,* Père L. Escoula continues *Le Verbe sauveur et illuminateur chez saint Irénée,* and Père A. Kerkvoorde begins an article on M. J. Scheeben, who was professor of dogmatics at Cologne and died in 1888. The latter article is concluded in the June number, which also contains *L'épopée babylonienne de Gilgamesh d'après les recherches récentes* by Ch.-F. Jean, and the first instalment of *Le sacerdoce et le sacrifice de Jésus-Christ d'après l'Epître aux Hébreux* by Père J. Bonsirven. This is concluded in the number for July-August, in which Père E. de Moreau has a note on double monasteries and Père P. Joüon one on the Annunciation as recorded by *Luke.*

DISCUSSIONS.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGION AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

In his comments upon my article in *The Congregational Quarterly* for January, 1939, Dr. Garvie first raises the interesting question of method, rightly giving a warning against the dangers of too readily concluding that resemblances in systems indicate the positive influence of one upon another. But this consideration of necessary caution does not absolutely rule out the method as entirely unjustifiable. As applied to the examination of New Testament thought-forms the case appears to some of us as follows. We encounter in the *N.T.* certain ideas (*e.g.,* a Logos Emanation from God, salvation from the rule of evil principalities and powers, new life through sacramental rites effecting communion with deity) which, if we could regard them freshly or if we came across them for the first time in another ancient religion, we should find foreign to our general mentality and valuations. (This judgment, it should be said, is made upon the thought-forms only and not upon the spiritual universalistic experiences to which they bear witness). Such thought-forms are indeed so strikingly unusual that the older religious thought sought to explain them as coming from another world. But there is a more natural alternative explanation.

When we find similar thought-forms appearing geographically and chronologically adjacent, arising intelligibly from the mental characteristics and syncretic tendencies of Hellenistic and Oriental circles, it is not unnatural to seek the explanation of these peculiar forms of *N.T.* speculation in some kind of influence from such a source. *There is more than a phenomenon of mere resemblance; there is something calling for explanation, and there is something which provides explanation.* Such foreign influence upon Judaism was evident before the Christian era in popular apocalypse and Alexandrian Jewish literature; this may have prepared the way to further direct grafts later. Surely few scholars today would deny the general claim that *N.T.* thought-forms were largely shaped by the ideas of the contemporary world not only Jewish but Gentile; the question for scholars is one of process and extent. Dr. Garvie refers me to Dr. Andrews: I turn up his Century Bible Handbook on the Apocrypha to read with satisfaction (p. 5):

> We cannot read the Epistles of Paul to-day without asking questions which never troubled theologians in the past. It is impossible to take Paul's statements just as we find them. We are bound to ask, What is the source from which he derived his ideas? What is the origin of the thought-forms in which he clothes his Christian experience? Whence does he obtain the categories which he uses in explaining the Person of Christ or the Doctrine of the Atonement? What is the validity of these ideas for modern theology?

Before leaving the question of method, one would not only acknowledge the danger of trying to make facts fit in, often unjustifiably, with a modern theory, but point out a similar danger of a bias, more or less unconscious, from ancient and classical tradition.

(2) In regard to the use of the term "Son of Man", Dr. Garvie is prepared to modify an earlier judgment by allowing that "not all passages in which the term is used must needs have an exclusive reference to Jesus Himself". Since my argument was chiefly built on the double use of the term, this important concession by Dr. Garvie is consistent with my thesis that (1) the earliest use of the term was *collective,* signifying the righteous of Israel, suffering, rejected but finally inheriting the Kingdom (as in *Dan.*); (2) later the term became applied in an exclusive sense to Jesus Himself; (3) a further use of the term in the *Similitudes of Enoch,* signifying a Heavenly Man and Parousial Messiah and Judge, became attached to Jesus when He became regarded as the individual Son of Man; (4) that in Hellenistic circles the Jewish Heavenly Son of Man became a Divine, worshipful *Kurios.* I do not see that this general thesis is much affected by the alternative interpretations of some of the passages which Dr. Garvie prefers. In any case I never claimed that "Son of Man" was used in a collective sense in *every* case in the Gospels as we have them. On the other hand I admitted that

> in our present records the "Son of Man" has unquestionably gained a personal significance; the term is a title for the historical Jesus and for the coming Christ of the Parousia.

The question is—was this *Similitudes* identification claimed by Jesus or made for Him by the early Church?

(3) So far from such a thesis destroying Christian faith it should be a help in affording relief from the intellectual and moral difficulties of that Second Adventism which sprang up in the early Church. There is no need to attribute to Jesus an unfulfilled and misleading claim of early visible return. There is further relief from the tendency of early speculative Christian thought to make Jesus an Arian deity. At the same time it cannot be too strongly stressed that the thesis is dealing with first-century *thought-forms,* and does not in the slightest challenge the spiritual supremacy of Jesus or the revelation of God through Him. Without accepting a *Parousial* or a *Kurios* category for the greatness of Jesus we can still gladly acknowledge that those who have seen Him full of grace and truth have seen the Father. Moreover, we realize that the very setting of Jesus in the highest categories of the age is in itself an impressive witness to His spiritual supremacy and appeal.

(4) A brief note may be added in reference to Dr. Garvie's comment concerning the Vision theory of the Resurrection—"For hallucinations or illusions there must be some antecedent conditions of expectation, belief or hope". Would the annals of the Society for Psychical Research support such a statement? We doubt it. One may also hold the Vision explanation of the Resurrection tradition without denying an objective fact of a Christ surviving beyond death. The Empty Tomb is another matter.

H. Bulcock.